Duke University Libraries
D02308332L

WILLIAM GREENOUGH THAYER SHEDD: REFORMED TRADITIONALIST, 1820 -- 1894

BY

BERNARD VERNON MUNGER

DUKE
UNIVERSITY

Universitas · Dukiana
Eruditio · et · Religio

LIBRARY

Date: March 21, 1957

Approved:

H. Shelton Smith

Waldo Beach

[illegible]

Robert E. Cushman

[illegible]

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Graduate School of
Arts and Sciences
of
Duke University

1957

Duke University Library

The use of this thesis is subject to the usual restrictions that govern the use of manuscript material. Reproduction or quotation of the text is permitted only upon written authorization from the author of the thesis and from the academic department by which it was accepted. Proper acknowledgment must be given in all printed references or quotations.

FORM 412 1M 11-43

WILLIAM GREENOUGH THAYER SHEDD:

REFORMED TRADITIONALIST, 1820--1894

by

Bernard Vernon Munger

Date: March 21, 1957

Approved:

H. Shelton Smith

Waldo Beach

[illegible]

Robert E. Cushman

[illegible]

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Graduate School of
Arts and Sciences
of
Duke University

1957

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Duke University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/williamgreenough00mung

Tr.R.
Ph.D.
M566W
1957

PREFACE

The present study of the theological thought of William Greenough Thayer Shedd was launched in 1949. At that time Shedd, although widely read in his generation, seemed almost forgotten. More recently, however, renewed interest in his mode of religious thought has manifested itself, especially within conservative groups. One evidence of this renewed interest is the reprinting of his massive three-volume Dogmatic Theology by the Zondervan Publishing House in 1953. The publicity material of that House boldly proclaimed Shedd as the author of one of the six most important theological treatises in the English language.

Conservative journals have warmly welcomed this reprinting and praised Shedd's system of thought. An example of this commendation is found in the Southern Presbyterian Journal, the publication of which played a major role in defeating

the Presbyterian Reunion in 1954. A prominent anti-reunionist, the Reverend Dr. John R. Richardson of Atlanta, Georgia, wrote in that Journal as follows:

> Dr. Shedd stands out as one of America's foremost exponents of the Reformed Faith. . . . In a day when there is a renewed interest in Theology, we are grateful that Zondervan Publishing House has again made this work available. . . . It is amazing how a work written nearly sixty years ago could be so relevant to our own day. Dr. Shedd has presented in these volumes the Reformed Faith with tremendous clarity and freshness. All who are interested in the Reformed Faith in one of its finest expressions should read Shedd's Dogmatic Theology.[1]

At the present time a new theological conservatism is undoubtedly emerging. In their efforts to add stature to conservative theology, adherents of scholastic Calvinism may be expected to return to Shedd with renewed enthusiasm. Thus it seems both important and valuable to present a dissertation designed to contribute to an understanding and evaluation of Shedd's scheme of Protestant thought.

This study is necessarily limited, and this limitation should be noted at the outset. It undertakes to explicate merely "the marrow" of Shedd's Calvinistic system, and lays no claim to attending to every theological detail in that system. In addition to analyzing the main points in that

---

1. John R. Richardson, "Dogmatic Theology," The Southern Presbyterian Journal (Weaverville, North Carolina), March 25, 1953, pp. 14-15, and October 7, 1953, pp. 21-22.

system, an effort has been made to point out some of the major limitations of it.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Gurney Harriss Kearns, High Point, North Carolina, for providing the Fellowship which first brought me to Duke University for graduate study. I am not only indebted, but also grateful, to Professor H. Shelton Smith of Duke University for his invaluable help in the preparation of this study. I am grateful to Mrs. Donn Michael Farris for typing these pages and preparing them for the bindery. To the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church, Corinth, Mississippi, I am indebted for the several times that their Session granted me a "leave of absence" in order that I could have opportunity to do nothing but study, write, and re-write these chapters.

Bernard Vernon Munger

Corinth, Mississippi
January 21, 1957

CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

Chapter

I WILLIAM GREENOUGH THAYER SHEDD: 1820 - 1894

1. Reformed Traditionalist 2

2. Conservative Critic 21

II REVELATION: NATURAL AND BIBLICAL

1. The Resource of Natural Reason 39

2. The Biblical Revelation 46

3. Historic Creeds and Revelation 51

III THE INTERPRETATION OF GOD

1. The Divine Existence 60

2. Personal Spirit and Trinal Being 63

3. The Attributes of Deity 71

4. The Sovereignty of God 94

a. In the Divine Decrees 94

b. In Creation and Providence 97

c. In Predestination 107

d. In Endless Punishment 116

IV THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST

1. A Professed Chalcedonian 123

2. Emphasis upon Uniqueness 125

a. The Human Nature 126

b. The Divine Control 129

c. The Alternating Self-Consciousness 133

3. A Chalcedonian with Differences? 135

V MAN AS CREATED AND AS FALLEN

1. Man's First Estate 142

2. The Sin and Fall of Man 149

VI ATONEMENT AND REDEMPTION

1. Atonement and Divine Wrath 155

2. Obedience and Divine Law 159

3. Atonement and Man 161

4. Regeneration 164

5. Conversion and Sanctification 166

VII THE NATURE OF HISTORY: SECULAR AND SACRED

1. The General Idea of History 174

2. The Nature of Secular History 178

3. The Nature of Sacred History 181

4. History and Doctrine 189

VIII CRITICAL REFLECTIONS

1. Against the Current 196

2. Champion of Scholastic Faith 199

3. A Summary of Shedd's System 201

4. Critical Comment on Specific Aspects 204

a. Speculative Emphasis 204

b. Inerrancy: Biblical and Traditional . . . 209

(1) Biblical Inerrancy 211

(2) Traditional Inerrancy 213

c. Christology 216

BIBLIOGRAPHY 229

WILLIAM GREENOUGH THAYER SHEDD:

REFORMED TRADITIONALIST, 1820--1894

Chapter I

WILLIAM GREENOUGH THAYER SHEDD: 1820--1894

1. Reformed Traditionalist

As "there arose a new king over Egypt, who did not know Joseph,"[1] so there have arisen several generations of theological students who have not known William G. T. Shedd. The time was, however, when the student who was eager to keep abreast of the current controversies in theology would turn readily in one of many theological journals to an article signed "W. G. T. Shedd." The time also was when a book by William Greenough Thayer Shedd was certain of third and fourth editions. That things changed rapidly before this century was very old is not so much evidence of personal opinions concerning the worth of the theology of Shedd, as it is evidence of a general

1. Exodus 1:8 RSV.

neglect of, if not antipathy toward, the Calvinist Scholasticism which, in American Church circles, culminated in the writings of Shedd. Within that circle of Calvinist Scholastics, Shedd filled a large place. It is indeed unfortunate that no one has made and published a definitive study of the life and work of this Christian scholar.

William Greenough Thayer Shedd was born to the Rev. Marshall and Eliza Thayer Shedd in Acton, Massachusetts, June 21, 1820. His father, Marshall Shedd, minister of the Congregational Church in Acton, was a fifth generation descendant of Daniel Shedd who came to Braintree, Massachusetts, in 1642. William's mother was a daughter of Obadiah Thayer, a wealthy Boston merchant.[2] Of the name Thayer it has been written: "nomen clare et praestantium, in the annals of New England."[3] William was named after William Greenough, a well-known New England philanthropist and friend of the Thayer family.

---

2. National Cyclopedia of American Biography (New York, 1897), VII, 318. See also: Kunitz, S. J., and Haycraft, H., American Authors, 1600-1900 (New York, 1938), p. 686; Brown, J. H., editor, The National Cyclopedia of American Biographies (Boston, 1903), VII, 318; Malone, Dumas, editor, Dictionary of American Biography (New York, 1935), XVII, 56; Prentis, George L., The Union Theological Seminary (New York, 1899), pp. 418-420; and DeWitt, John, "William Greenough Thayer Shedd," The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, VI (New York, April, 1895), 295-322.

3. Smart, Isaac C., "William Greenough Thayer Shedd," The Vermont Alumni Weekly (Burlington, Vt., May 5, 1926), V, No. 27, 427-428.

Shedd prepared for college at Westport, Vermont, while his father was minister of the Congregational Church in Willsboro, New York, just opposite the University of Vermont, on the shores of Lake Champlain. At the age of fifteen, Shedd entered the University of Vermont. In 1839, upon his graduation from the University, he went to New York City to teach in the public schools. He taught there but one year.

During the time he taught in New York City schools, Shedd publicly confessed his faith in Jesus Christ and joined the Brainerd Presbyterian Church on Rigington Street. Asa Dodge Smith had helped organize this congregation in 1834 and was serving as minister at the time Shedd was received into membership. Smith later became Professor of Pastoral Theology in Union Theological Seminary, and still later, the President of Dartmouth College.

In 1840, Shedd entered the classrooms of Andover Theological Seminary to study for the ministry. During the time he was a student there, Shedd knew as active professors: Edwards A. Park, Austin Phelps, Bela B. Edwards, Ralph Emerson, and Edward Robinson. Leonard Woods and Moses Stuart were still on Andover's campus, though by this time not active professors. In 1843, Shedd graduated from Andover.

During the years 1843-1845, Shedd served the Brandon, Vermont Congregational Church. Many of the sermons which he later published were written and delivered to this congregation.

After this brief pastorate, Shedd was appointed Professor of English in the University of Vermont. President Buckham said of him: "He taught English wherever he wrote and spoke, no matter what office he held at the University."[4] Shedd held this position until 1852 when he left Vermont to serve as Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in Auburn Theological Seminary.

On February 15, 1854, Shedd returned to New England to be inaugurated to the chair of Ecclesiastical History at Andover Seminary. He served on the faculty at Andover for eight years, leaving in 1862 to become assistant to the Reverend Gardiner Spring, minister of Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City. From that time forward he was a Presbyterian.

Since so much of the general pattern of Shedd's thought and work was fixed within the twenty-two year period between his entrance into Andover as a theological student and his departure from the Andover Faculty, it is of importance that something of this development of position be traced.

Perhaps Shedd's position began to take characteristic shape when he began to appreciate the character of the Puritans. His essay, "The Puritan Character," was first printed in the <u>Christian Observatory</u>, March, 1847. "The fundamental trait of the Puritan character," Shedd wrote, "upon which all its excellencies rest, and by which even its faults are to be

---

4. Smart, Isaac C., <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 427.

explained is, spirituality of mind."[5]

> This spirituality of mind is the disposition to believe in the supernatural, the ability to realize it without the aid of visible things, and the inclination to refer to it in thought and action. . . . From this sprang the many virtues, and the few faults of the Puritans.[6]

It was this "spirituality" which Shedd believed accounted for the fact that the Puritans received, adopted for their own, and propagated the theology of Augustine and Calvin, an "exceedingly spiritual and soul-searching theology."[7] The result of this "spirituality" was a character which Shedd believed to be a model for imitation. "We ought to study it until we see it in all its massive strength and simple beauty. We ought to invigorate ourselves by drawing fresh life from the spirituality of our ancestors."[8]

Four years later, in a discourse given before a college audience, Shedd was clear in his praises of the Puritan character, saying:

> Every truly great and grand character, be it individual or national, is more or less a severe one; a character which, comparatively, is more intellectual and moral, than aesthetic. . . . The Puritanism of Old England and of New England will readily suggest itself to every one as the one eminently austere national character with which the power and glory of the English and Anglo-American races, and the highest hopes of the modern world, are vitally connected.[9]

---

5. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Literary Essays (New York, 1878), p. 232.

6. Ibid., p. 234.

7. Ibid., pp. 239-240.

8. Ibid., p. 243.

9. Ibid., pp. 18-20.

"In the light of this," concluded Shedd, "our task is to retain the strict, heroic, intellectual and religious spirit of the Puritan and the Pilgrim in the forms of an advancing civilization."[10] Thus William G. T. Shedd was not only a Puritan by birth, but a Puritan by choice, and by diligent cultivation of the Puritan character traits.

The manner in which Shedd sought to direct his own character development is to be discovered in his description of the "Intellectual Character And Habits of The Clergyman."[11] In this chapter of the book of lectures which he had given in Auburn Seminary, Shedd suggests the type of intellectual character which he believed to be worth seeking. He said that "the clergyman ought to aim at choiceness in his education. He should strive after ripe scholarship, and such mental traits as profundity, comprehensiveness, clearness, and force."[12] Then, in speaking to the subject of the chief means and methods of forming such an intellectual character, he said: "These may all be reduced to one, namely, the daily, nightly, and everlasting study of standard authors."[13] This same emphasis he repeated and underscored in the simple sentence: "Choice and high culture is the fruit of communion

---

10. Ibid., p. 35.

11. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Homiletics and Pastoral Theology (New York, 1875), pp. 345-370.

12. Ibid., p. 347. 13. Ibid., p. 348.

"In the light of this," concluded Shedd, "how true is it [illegible] the simple, heroic, intellectual and religious spirit of the Puritan and the Pilgrim in the forms of an advancing civilization."[10] Thus William G. T. Shedd was not only a Puritan by birth, but a Puritan by choice, and by all [illegible] cultivation of the Puritan character traits.

The manner in which Shedd sought to direct his own character development is to be discovered in his description of the "Intellectual" character and habits of the clergyman."[11] In this section of the book of lectures which he has given in [illegible], Shedd suggests the type of intellectual character which he believed to be worth seeking. He said that "the clergyman ought to aim at choiceness in his education. He should strive after ripe scholarship, and such mental habits as profundity, comprehensiveness, clearness, and [illegible]."[12] Then, in speaking to the subject of the quiet [illegible] and aspects of [illegible], he said: "These may all be reduced to one, namely, the [illegible] dignity, and everlasting study of standard authors."[13] This same emphasis is repeated and underscored in the chapter on [illegible]: "Choice and high culture is the [illegible] of common

---

10. Ibid., p. 35.

11. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Homiletics and the [illegible], [illegible], 1879), pp. 345-370.

12. Ibid., p. [illegible]. 13. Ibid., p. [illegible].

with the very finest and loftiest intellects of the race."[14] This is the discipline he practiced and the communion he enjoyed. To be sure, his mind had its special interests, and the disciplines he taught and wrote about were likewise specialized, but, these by no means exhausted his reading, nor the allusions which his lectures and writings contain to lofty intellects in other departments. Shedd, through the avenue of study, sought to arrive at that comprehensiveness of mind which revealed acquaintance with the ripest scholarship of the ages.

For all his desired catholicity of acquaintance, he nevertheless came to achieve an intellectual character which viewed all centuries from the standpoint of one. It is fruitful to follow this development from the first beginning which the records afford.

The only youthful influence that Shedd acknowledges is that which radiated from Professor James Marsh. Marsh was professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont at the time Shedd was a student. Much that has been said and written concerning the influence of Marsh upon Shedd has been arrived at more by deduction and inference

---

14. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, p. 349.

with the very [illegible],

[illegible] disciple he practiced [illegible] he en-

[illegible]. To be sure, his mind had its special interests, and

the disciplines he taught and wrote about were likewise

[illegible], but, those by no means exhausted his reading, [illegible]

[illegible] which his lectures and writings show him to [illegible]

[illegible] in other departments. Green, through the avenue

of [illegible], sought to arrive at that comprehensiveness of mind

which [illegible] acquaintance with the highest scholarship of

[illegible].

[illegible] all his desired catholicity of [illegible], he

[illegible] came to acquire an intellectual character which

viewed all centuries from the standpoint of one. It is fruit-

[illegible]

[illegible].

The only youthful influence that Green acknowledged is

that which he received from Professor James Marsh. Marsh was

Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the Univer-

sity of Vermont at the time Green was a student. Much that

has been said and written concerning the influence of Marsh

upon Green has been arrived at more by deduction and inference

---

1. [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible], p. [illegible]

than in any other way.[15] However, deduction and inference must be used if anything in the way of understanding is to result.

Professor Marsh wrote the "Preliminary Essay" for, and edited, the first American edition of the Aids To Reflection by Coleridge. This was published in 1829. The response was encouraging.[16] Among the letters which Marsh received concerning this publication, one is interesting in itself, whether or not the conjecture is correct that it came from Leonard Woods, Abbot Professor of Theology at Andover Seminary. In the letter are to be found these words:

Thirdly, Coleridge goes much farther than I expected he would, in maintaining what I consider fundamental principles, as to the Christian religion. Most of his practical views--I mean his views on the nature of Christian piety, and of the Christian life, seem to me scriptural and excellent; and I have fewer objections to make to his doctrinal opinions, than I supposed I should have when I read your preface. This fact leads me to think, either that you have somehow misapprehended the prevailing sentiment of the orthodox in New England, or else that I differ from them more than I am aware. As to many things which Coleridge asserts on the philosophy of religion, (if I am so happy as to understand him) I hold the same; though it would seem that both you and he regard those things as at war with what Calvinists believe.[17]

---

15. Smart, Isaac C., op. cit., p. 427. See also Strout, Cushing, "Faith and History: The Mind of William G. T. Shedd," Journal of the History of Ideas, XV (January, 1954), 153.

16. Wells, Ronald Vale, Three Christian Transcendentalists: James Marsh, Caleb Henry, Frederic Hedge (New York, 1943), p. 20.

17. Ibid., pp. 153-154. Quoted from a letter printed in Torrey, The Remains of The Rev. James Marsh, p. 100.

than in any other way.[15] However, deviation and difference will be used if anything in the way of understanding is to result.

Professor Marsh wrote the "Preliminary Essay" for, and edited, the first American edition of the *Aids to Reflection* of Coleridge. This was published in 1829. The response was disappointing.[16] Among the letters which Marsh received concerning this publication, one is interesting in itself, whether or not the conjecture is correct that it came from Leonard Woods, Abbot Professor of Theology at Andover Seminary. In the letter are to be found these words:

> Plainly, Coleridge goes much farther than I expected he would, in undermining what I consider fundamental principles, as to the Christian religion. Most of his practical views--I mean his views on the nature of Christian piety, and of the Christian life, seem to be scriptural and excellent; and I have fewer objections to make to his doctrinal opinions, than I supposed I should have when I read your preface. This fact leads me to think, either that you have somewhat misapprehended the prevailing sentiment of the orthodox in New England, or else that I differ from them more than I am aware. As to many things which Coleridge asserts on the philosophy of religion, (if I am so happy as to understand him) I think he errs; though it would seem that both you and he regard those things as at war with what Calvinists believe.[17]

---

15. Smart, Isaac C., *Op. cit.*, p. 427. See also [illegible], "Truth and History: The Mind of William G. T. Shedd," [illegible].

16. Wells, Ronald Vale, *Three Christian Transcendentalists: James Marsh, Caleb Sprague Henry, Frederic Henry Hedge* (New York, 1943), p. 40.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 153-154. Quoted from a letter printed in Torrey, *The Remains of the Rev. James Marsh*, [illegible].

The manner in which Aids to Reflection was received, set Marsh to working on a proposed four-volume series of books on seventeenth-century divines. This was a natural result, since he believed the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century to have furnished a background for the work of Coleridge.[18] In 1830, Marsh edited volume one of his projected series, entitled Select Practical Theology of the Seventeenth Century. This book was not well enough received to warrant the continuation of the plan. However, these matters suggest that by 1835, when Shedd entered the University of Vermont, Marsh had fully acquainted himself with the seventeenth century divines, as well as with Coleridge, and was passing his enthusiasm on to his students. Shedd shared Marsh's enthusiasm. His enthusiasm for Coleridge is well known, since he published an edition of the Works of Coleridge in 1852 and wrote in the "Introductory Essay":

We think that this author is worthy of study for his general method of theologizing, and as an able defender and expounder of the doctrines of Christianity, on grounds of reason and philosophy.[19]

Now it seems to us that this mind, having received such a profound discipline in Philosophy, and that too a spiritual and theistic Philosophy, and being led both by its original tendency and the operation of Divine Grace, to the study and

---

18. Willey, Basil, "The Cambridge Platonists," in The Seventeenth Century Background (New York, 1934).

19. Shedd, Wm. G. T., editor, The Works of Coleridge, with an introductory essay by the Editor (New York, 1868), I, 36.

The manner in which [illegible] was [illegible], and [illegible] working on a proposed four-volume series of books on seventeenth-century divines. This was a natural result, since he believes the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century to have furnished a background for the work of Coleridge.[14] In 1830, Marsh edited volume one of his projected series, entitled *Select Practical [illegible] of the Seventeenth [illegible]*. This book was not well enough received to warrant the continuation of the plan. However, these methods [illegible] [illegible] 1835, when Shedd entered the University of Vermont, [illegible] and [illegible] acquainted himself with the seventeenth century divines, as well as with Coleridge, and was passing his enthusiasm on to his students. [illegible] shared Marsh's enthusiasm. His enthusiasm for Coleridge is well known, since he published an edition of the Works of Coleridge in 1853 and [illegible] in the "Introductory Essay":

[illegible] think that this author is worthy of study for his general [illegible] of theologizing, and as [illegible] defender and expounder of the doctrines of Christianity, on grounds of reason and philosophy.[15]

[illegible] it seems to us that this mind, having received such a [illegible] discipline in philosophy, and that too a spiritual [illegible] philosophy, and being led [illegible] by its original [illegible] and the operation of divine grace, to the study [illegible]

---

14. [illegible], "The Cambridge Platonists," in *The Seventeenth Century Background* (New York, 1934).

15. Shedd, Wm. G. T., editor, *The Works of Coleridge*, *with an Introductory Essay* [illegible] (New York, [illegible]), I, [illegible].

defence of the truths of the Christian religion, on grounds of reason, is eminently fitted to be a guide and aid to reflection in this direction.[20]

We believe that these speculations of Coleridge will help to fortify the minds of the rising generation of educated men, in that platonic method of philosophizing, which has come down through all the mutations in the philosophic world, which has survived them all, which, more than any other method, has shown affinity with Religion--natural and revealed--and which, through its doctrine of seminal and germinant ideas, has been the fertile root of all the finest growths and fruitages of the human mind.[21]

Such was Shedd's enthusiasm for Coleridge. But, by the time these words had been printed, Shedd's enthusiasm for the seventeenth-century divines had come to exceed his enthusiasm for Coleridge.

Examples of Shedd's admiration for the divines of the seventeenth century are to be found in a variety of places in his works. However, the following quotations will reveal that even by the time Shedd left New England to go to Auburn Seminary, he had chosen his favorite century, and his favorite divines.

It was an age of belief, of profound convictions, of linguistic, reverent, and contemplative study of the word of God . . . . This was the ethics, and this was the drama, of a period for which God was a living person, the Bible an inspired book, and the future life a solemn reality.[22]

---

20. Shedd, editor, <u>The Works of Coleridge</u>, I, 38.

21. <u>Ibid</u>., I, 62.

22. Shedd, Wm. G. T., <u>Homiletics and Pastoral Theology</u>, pp. 18-19.

> . . . there never was more substantial and sincere unity of belief than among the Protestant clergy of England and the Continent during those highly theological centuries, the sixteenth and seventeenth. There was no invention of new theories, but the old and established theory, the one orthodox faith of the Christian Church, was made to pass through each individual mind, and so come forth with all the freshness and freedom of a new creation.[23]

> That unearthly sermonizing of Baxter and Howe, so abstracted from all the temporal and secular interests of man, so rigorously confined to human guilt and human redemption . . . that preaching so destitute of all literary, scientific, economical, and political elements and allusions,--was, nevertheless, by indirection, one of the most fertile causes of the progress of England and America. Subtract it as one of the forces of English history, and the career of the Anglo-Saxon race would be like that of Italy and Spain.[24]

So great was Shedd's enthusiasm for the divines of the seventeenth century.

Not only had Shedd found his favorite divines, and his favorite century, but also his favorite creedal statement. In 1858, in a discourse delivered before the Congregational Library Association, Shedd spoke to what he called the "necessity that exists in Congregationalism for a bolder confidence in creed-statements, in order to its highest efficiency as a Christian denomination."[25] He began by rehearsing the virtues of John Owen, John Howe, Thomas Goodwin, and John Robinson, as seventeenth-century divines who shaped Congregationalism

---

23. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, p. 177.

24. Ibid., p. 249.

25. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Theological Essays (New York, 1877), p. 322.

. . . Never [illegible] was more successful and sincere [illegible] united than among the Protestant clergy of England and the [illegible] whose highly theological centuries, the sixteenth and seventeenth. There was no [illegible] Protestants, but the old and established theory, the one orthodox faith of the Christian Church, was made to pass through each individual mind, and so come forth with all the freshness and freedom of a new creation.[25]

That [illegible] summarizing of Baxter and Howe, so absorbed upon all the temporal and secular interests of man, so rightly [illegible] to human pains and human perception . . . [illegible] preceding the sacrifice of all literary, scientific, economical, and political elements and ambitions,--was, nevertheless, [illegible] interesting, one of the most [illegible] causes of the progress of England and America. Subtract it as one of the forces in English history, and the career of the Anglo-Saxon race would be like that of Italy and Spain.[26]

So great was Shedd's enthusiasm for the divines of the seventeenth century.

Not only had Shedd found his favorite divines, and his favorite century, but also his favorite creedal statements. In 18[illegible], in a discourse delivered before the Congregational Library Association, Shedd spoke to what he called the "necessity that exists in Congregationalism for a bolder confidence in creed-statements, in order to its highest efficiency as a Christian denomination."[27] He began by rehearsing the virtues of [illegible], John Howe, Thomas Goodwin, and John [illegible], the seventeenth-century divines who shaped Congregationalism

25. [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible], p. [illegible].

26. Ibid., p. 249.

27. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Theological Essays (New York, 1877), p. 322.

and at the same time gave whole-hearted allegiance to the doctrinal points of the Westminster Confession. From there he went on to show how there have always been those within Congregationalism who have witnessed to the need for loyalty to a self-chosen creed. On the basis of this, he suggested that the time had come for Congregationalism, as a denomination, to choose as its creed, that system of doctrine embodied in the Westminster Confession. Having said this, he concluded:

> To deepen a feeling which already exists in Congregationalism; to strengthen a confidence which has never died out, has been the purpose of these remarks. Whether this feeling and confidence should once more give itself expression in the formal action of the denomination is a question that will be answered variously. But, will not all agree that the action of the denomination at Cambridge, at Boston, and Saybrook, has never been repudiated; that if Congregationalism has any corporate existence, and any organic life, by which it maintains its identity from generation to generation, it is still committed to the symbols that were then and there made public.[26]

There seems to be little doubt but that Shedd's preoccupation with thoughts of "sin and atonement" led to his high respect for the doctrinal system of the Westminster Confession. Already in 1847 Shedd had expressed his views concerning the prime importance of sin and atonement in Christian theology. Concerning the Puritan theology, he wrote:

---

26. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, p. 353.

It ushers man directly into the eternal world; and in view of its scenes and realities, he is led to make his peace with God through the atonement of God. It charges utter sinfulness upon man, convicts and eternally damns him, brings him trembling in his guiltiness to the foot of God where he ought to be, and then bids him look up, to see if indeed there may be mercy for him.[27]

In his lectures on homiletics, given in Auburn Theological Seminary in 1852, 1853 and 1854, there are these sentences which point up this matter of the prime importance of sin and atonement:

Man in the Bible is intensely guilty . . . . The Old Testament, especially, to which the preacher must go for knowledge upon these themes, because the Old Dispensation was the educational dispensation of law, is full, firm, and distinct in its representations. Its history is the history of an economy designed by its rites, symbols, and doctrines to awaken a poignant and constant consciousness of guilt. Its prophecy looks with eager straining eye, and points with tremulous and thrilling finger, to an Atoner, and His Atonement for guilt. Its poetry, is either the irrepressible mourning and wail of a heart gnawed by guilt, or the exuberant and glad overflow of a heart experiencing the joy of expiated and pardoned guilt. . . . This doctrine of expiation, in the Christian system, is like a ganglion in the human frame; it is a knot of nerves; it is the oscillating centre where several primal and vital truths meet in unity. This single doctrine of sacrificial oblation is a vast implication. It implies the personality of God, with all its elements of power. It involves the absolute self-will and responsibility of the creature in the origin of sin. It implies the necessary, inexorable nature of justice. And, if we analyze these again, we shall find them full of 'the seeds of all things,' full of the substance and staple of both ethics and evangelism. Those portions of the Bible, therefore, which treat of this central truth of Christianity, either directly or indirectly, should receive the most serious and careful investigation.[28]

---

27. Shedd, "The Puritan Character," Literary Essays, pp. 239-240.

28. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 270-272.

Herein is reflected the mind of Shedd concerning the center of Christian truth. And, this "center of Christian truth" was rooted in a proper and true understanding of the nature of sin. Twice in the introductory essay Shedd prefaced to the Works of Coleridge he suggested that:

> A profound view of sin is the deep and strong soil from which all sound, healthy, and healing growth in theological speculation shoot up. Depth and truth of theory here, is the very best preventive of errors and misconceptions elsewhere, and the very best mitigation, and remedy for them, if they exist.[29]

All of this prepared Shedd to appreciate the doctrinal system of the Westminster Confession, for in this regard, he said:

> The scientific statement of the doctrine of original sin has made no advance since the statement made in 1648 by the Westminster Assembly. . . . It is plain that there will be no 'progress in theology' by this route.[30]

This helps toward an understanding of Shedd's plea to the Congregationalists to take their stand on the Westminster Confession. This plea was somewhat in the nature of a valedictory for Shedd in the Congregational Church. Within four years, he had left Andover, and New England, and had accepted a call to the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City. This was but outward confirmation of earlier inward decision to

---

29. Shedd, editor, Works of Coleridge, I, 50, 45.

30. Shedd, Wm. G. T., "Sin a Nature, and That Nature Guilt," The Christian Review, XVII (January, 1852), 2.

conform his faith to that system of doctrine carefully outlined in the Westminster Confession. His attachment to the theology of Westminster and his departure from New England and the Congregational Church were all of a piece. John DeWitt has written as follows of this particular period in Shedd's life:

> The tendency of New England thought had a contrary direction from that pointed to by Shedd. The attitude of the Congregational ministry as a whole was wanting in theological enthusiasm and the disposition to refuse longer to insist upon Calvinism as a condition of ministerial fellowship within the communion was rapidly gaining strength. Because of the growing strength of this tendency with which he had no sympathy, it was easy for Dr. Shedd to accept the call to minister in a Presbyterian church.[31]

DeWitt's statement, although unsubstantiated in any way, is nevertheless not without foundation. The following letter, written to the editor of the Christian Magazine of the South by Peter Gordon, Thomasville, Connecticut, is pertinent here:

> There is reason to fear that there is a sad falling-away from those doctrines which were preached with so much fidelity and unction by the Fathers of New England, and which tended so powerfully to the formation of that character for virtue and intelligence, for which they have been so long distinguished. A ministerial brother, pastor of a Congregational Church in this State, alluding to the present state of things among them, writes to me: "You are probably not aware of the strong prejudices entertained against some of the leading doctrines of the Confession of Faith, not only by a vast majority of the people, but also by a great proportion of the Congregational ministers in Connecticut. It is somewhat unpleasant

---

31. DeWitt, "William Greenough Thayer Shedd," op. cit., p. 311.

to be connected with an Ecclesiastical body, where a majority, perhaps, of its members repudiate some of its prominent doctrines.[32]

Thus Shedd's removal from Andover to New York City came at a time when it would have been most congenial to his spirit to move into the fold of those who accepted wholeheartedly the Westminster Confession. Such was the congregation of Brick Presbyterian Church under the leadership of Gardiner Spring, Old School Presbyterian. Of a certainty, by this time, for Shedd, the period of formation was over. With his move to New York City, Shedd began publication of those books which made him a powerful influence in the defence and maintenance of the Calvinist Tradition as represented in the Presbyterian Church.

From this time on Shedd must be recognized as one who gave his mind and talents in the interest of proclaiming, promoting, and defending a system of doctrine. This part of his life began in earnest in 1863 when he published his two-volume History of Christian Doctrine. On January 11, 1864, Shedd was inaugurated as Professor of Biblical Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. In 1874 he became Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary. This position he held until his retirement in 1890. Thus,

---

32. Gordon, Peter, "Letter to the Editor," Christian Magazine of the South, VII (September, 1850), 272.

be as [illegible] as an ecclesiastical body, [illegible] a major-
ity, however, of its members repudiate some of its primary
doctrines.[32]

Thus Smith's removal from Andover to New York City came at a time when it would have been most congenial to his spirit to move into the fold of those who accepted wholeheartedly the Westminster Confession. Such was the comprehension of [illegible] Presbyterian Church under the leadership of [illegible] [illegible] Old School Presbyterian. It is certain, by this time, that [illegible] the period of formation was over. When his work [illegible] New York City, [illegible] began publication of those books which [illegible] a powerful influence in the defense and maintenance of the Calvinist tradition as represented in the Presbyterian Church.

From this time on Smith must be recognized as one who grew [illegible] and talents in the interest of proclaiming, promoting, and defending a system of doctrine. This part of his life began in earnest in 1853 when he published his two-volume History of Christian Doctrine. In [illegible], Smith was inaugurated as Professor of Biblical Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. In 1854 he became Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary. This position he held until his retirement in 1870. Thus,

---

32. Gordon, Peter, "Letter to the Editor," *Christian Mirror of the Weekly*, VII [illegible], 272.

in both his teaching and writing, he was giving himself to the service of a system of doctrine.

Following the publication of his two-volume history, there appeared in succession: Homiletics and Pastoral Theology (1867), Sermons to the Natural Man (1871), Theological Essays (1877), A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary upon the Epistle of Paul to the Romans (1879), Sermons to the Spiritual Man (1884), The Doctrine of Endless Punishment (1885), and his magnum opus, Dogmatic Theology (1888). The direction of all these works is pointed up in the preface to the last named work. Concerning his system of doctrine, Shedd said:

> It will be objected by some that this dogmatic system has been too much influenced by the patristic, medieval, and reformation periods, and too little by the so-called 'progress' of modern theology. The charge of scholasticism and perhaps speculativeness will be made. The author has no disposition to repel the charge . . . . It is the author's conviction that there were some minds in the former ages of Christianity who were called by Providence to do a work that will never be outgrown and left behind by the Christian Church; some men who thought more deeply, and came nearer to the center of truth, upon some subjects, than any modern minds . . . . If this treatise has any merits, they are due very much to daily and nightly communion with that noble army of theologians which is composed of the elite of the fathers, of the schoolmen, of the reformers, and of the 17th century divines of England and the continent.[33]

This was the direction of Shedd's labors. This is that which gave to his labors what could be called "comprehensiveness," but which Shedd would have preferred to have recognized

---

33. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Dogmatic Theology (second edition, New York, 1889), I, vi-viii.

he took his teaching and writing, so that [illegible] reached a system of doctrine.

Following the publication of his two-volume history, there appeared in succession: Homiletics and Pastoral Theology (1867), Sermons to the Natural Man (1871), Theological Essays (1877), a Critical and Doctrinal Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (1879), Sermons to the Spiritual Man (1884), The Doctrine of Endless Punishment (1886), and his magnum opus, Dogmatic Theology (1888). The direction of all these works is pointed up in the preface to the last named. Concerning his system of doctrine, Shedd said:

> It will be objected by some that this dogmatic system has been too much influenced by the patristic, mediaeval, and reformation periods, and too little by the so-called 'progressive' modern theology. The charge of conservatism and perhaps antiquatedness will be made. The author has no disposition to repel the charge. . . . It is the author's conviction that there were some men in the former ages of Christianity who were called by providence to do a work that will never be outgrown and left behind by the Christian Church; some men who thought more deeply, and came nearer to the centre of truth, upon some subjects, than any modern minds. . . . If this treatise has any merits, they are due very much to daily and nightly communion with that noble army of theologians which is composed of the elite of the fathers, of the schoolmen, of the reformers, and of the 17th century divines of England and the continent.[35]

This was the direction of Shedd's labors. This is [illegible] which gave to his labors what could be called "conservatism," but which Shedd would have preferred to have recognized

---

[35] W. G. T. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology (New York: Scribner's, 1888), I, vi-viii.

as the reflections of the truths God had given in former times, through the life and work of one whose mind was attuned to those minds to whom the truth had been given.

The purpose of his efforts is summed up in the subtitle of his book: Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, a defense of the Westminster Standards. Shedd, however, would never have limited his purpose to this. He liked to think of his work in this light:

> One aim of the author is to justify and defend before the human understanding, that intellectual and powerful system of theology which had its origin in the Biblical studies and personal experience of the two most comprehensive and scientific theologians of Christendom: Aurelius Augustine and John Calvin.[34]

> The best interest of the Christian religion and Church require the continual existence and influence of that comprehensive and self-consistent creed which Augustine formulated out of Scriptures, and Calvin re-affirmed and re-enforced.[35]

Those words, taken from the concluding paragraph of Shedd's last work, sum up that which Shedd believed to be for the "best interest of the Church." It was to promote those best interests that William G. T. Shedd gave himself without hesitation or withdrawal.

Only once did Shedd serve as commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. That was

---

34. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, a defense of the Westminster Standards (New York, 1893), p. vii.

35. Ibid., p. 156.

in the year 1868. While in attendance at the General Assembly, he drafted the report concerning those who were the recognized leaders of the New School Presbyterian Church. This report asserted that the published views of these New School Presbyterians must be regarded as "essential Calvinism." For this work Shedd is given a measure of the credit for bringing about the reunion of the New School and Old School Presbyterian Churches in 1869.[36]

During the years 1889-1894, Shedd occupied a position of leadership among the number of those who sought to keep the General Assembly and the Presbyteries from carrying through a proposed plan to revise the Westminster Standards. As this work was crowned with success with the decision of the Assembly to discontinue the attempts at revision, William Greenough Thayer Shedd died at his home in November, 1894, leaving the work of the church in the hands of other men--men such as Henry Van Dyke, minister of Brick Presbyterian Church, who visited Shedd regularly in his illness.

---

36. Presbyterian Reunion Memorial Volume (New York, 1871), pp. 285-291. See also, Thompson, R. E., A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States, in American Church History Series, vol. VI (third edition, New York, 1907), pp. 173-177.

2. Conservative Critic

Shedd was more than a propagandist for a system of doctrine. He was a critic of his times. He was opposed to so much that was part of his times and to so many of the people of his times that it would not be amiss to call him a "man at odds with his world." If it be helpful in the understanding of a man to know what he is against, the writings of Shedd provide an abundance of such helpful material. It is to that material we now turn to fill out our picture of William Greenough Thayer Shedd.

The general pattern of American life struck Shedd as exhibiting signs of decay. He believed that much had already been lost from the American character. He wrote:

> We are not so sound and healthy as a people as we were a generation ago. The devitalization is seen in the vices that prevail over the whole extent of the land. . . . It is seen in the amusements of the people, especially in our large cities . . . . The national decay is seen again in mercantile deceit and breach of trusts, which have become so wide-spread as to inspire foreign and domestic capital with alarm; causing a general destruction of both individual and national credit, and producing a general stagnation. It is seen in the venality and profligacy of politics, municipal, state, and federal, which has sunk republican government almost to the level of the worst specimens of monarchy in the times of the second Charles and the French Regency.[37]

> Luxury and ease, the results of advancing civilization and improvement in the arts, are enervating us. False principles in social organization, in government, and in religion, are stealing, like slow poison, through our arteries.[38]

---

37. Shedd, Literary Essays, p. vii.

38. Ibid., p. 243.

There were times when Shedd had a quick and ready word concerning how this situation came about, and how it could be changed. On one such occasion he put it simply: "The existing demoralization in society and politics, in this city, is due, mainly, to a disbelief in the doctrine of endless punishment."[39]

For the most part, however, he recognized the solution to the problem to be of a much more long-range nature. His mature judgment on the matter was that--

> Unless an upbuilding and establishing influence proceeds from the educated class, the disorganizing elements which are already in a furious fermentation in society will eventually dissolve all that is solid and fixed in it; and unless this class feel some stronger and purer influence than that of this world; unless it feels the power of the objects and principles of the other world; it will hasten, rather than counteract, the coming dissolution.[40]

For such a long-range program, Shedd did not look to the political forces of his day. Rather, he believed that American politics was itself part of the problem. He believed that it was an American fault that an inferior department of life, such as politics, had been over-estimated in importance. He considered "excessive devotion to the business of self-government" a great "evil in America."[41] It shall be, said

---

39. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy (New York, 1893), p. 196.

40. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 50-51.

41. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 254.

Shedd, "a happy day when the masses of our citizens shall be as greatly excited upon the subject of morals and religion as they are upon politics, and as moderate in their political excitements as they now are in their religion."[42]

To bring about this happy day was, for Shedd, one of the duties of the men who educate the minds of other men. Shedd called upon the educators and the clergymen to return to and proclaim the old doctrine "that no vocation is so honorable as that of clergyman or teacher; that next to this stands the lawyer and physician; and that next to these professions stands some legitimate and useful occupation or business."[43]

This does not mean that he scorned the arena of political life. He entertained a very high ideal concerning the type of man needed in public life. He elaborated upon his ideal, saying:

> A man at the present day needs a double portion of pure and lofty principle, and should anxiously place himself under the most select influences. If the serious political spirit of Washington, Jay, and Madison is ever again to actuate our politics, it will be only through the return of that reverence for law, as flowing from a higher reality than the naturally corrupt will of man, and that faith in government as having its ground and sanctions in the supernatural and religious world, which characterized them. If politics is ever to cease to be a game, and is ever again to be considered as one of the solemn interests pertaining to human experience, it will be only when our young men enter this field under the

---

42. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 262.

43. Ibid., p. 258.

influence of studies, and a discipline that purge away low and sordid views, and induce a serious integrity and a self-sacrificing patriotism.[44]

Shedd believed that the politics of his day was a "far cry" from the days of this country's political greatness.

As Shedd was disappointed in the political leadership of his day, so he was disappointed in the literature of his day. He saw in it "no power to educate,"[45] something he believed to be a characteristic of all great literature. He believed that the last writer whose literature contained real life and educative power was Milton.[46] He did not look to contemporary literature for leadership in the long-range program which would stem the tide of national decay. As with politics, so with literature, "yesterday was better," in Shedd's estimation.

Shedd was even less pleased with the science of his day. One of his common phrases was "infidel physics." In an essay under that title, he insisted that "it is the tendency to deduction which is making infidels of naturalists in this generation."[47] He described the situation in these words:

---

44. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 49.

45. Ibid., p. 39.

46. Ibid. For a fuller development of this same theme see: Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 351-353, and Shedd, Literary Essays, pp. 20-29.

47. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 103-104.

These modern naturalists have fastened upon some general principles discovered by greater and more reverent minds than theirs, have postulated these as the ultimate fact, and have gone on making deductions and forming theories which 'untenant creation of its God,' and deify matter and material forces.[48]

Shedd believed that the science of his day had become totally materialistic and mechanistic. He believed that the contemporary scientist, when pressed for an explanation of certain things which were generally not appreciated as adhering to materialism or mechanism, would, thereupon, postulate for matter just enough of the properties of mind to keep them from acknowledging God.[49] Shedd saw no cure for this within the sphere of science itself so long as the scientists maintained their "uncommon absorption in physical objects and problems."[50] The only ray of hope he saw in contemporary science was the fact that the human mind was certain one day to rebel against being asked to be content "with minute observations of the five senses helped by instruments."[51] One of his most pointed criticisms concerned the provincialism of the scientist:

---

48. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 104.

49. Shedd, "Hume, Huxley, On Miracles," The Presbyterian Review, I (January 1880), 12-14.

50. Shedd, "Comparative Certainty of Physics and Metaphysics," The Presbyterian Review, III (August 1882), 3.

51. Shedd, "Hume . . . ," op. cit., p. 33.

[illegible] being [illegible] with [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] materialism and [illegible], the [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] which [illegible] [illegible] of its [illegible] and [illegible] matter and material forces.[48]

Shedd believed that the science of his day had become mainly materialistic and mechanistic. He believed that the contemporary scientist, who provided for an explanation of certain things which were generally not considered as admitting of explanation [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] just enough of the [illegible] of man to keep [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].[49] Shedd saw no cure for this within the sphere of science itself so long as the scientist [illegible] [illegible] "[illegible] absorption in physical objects and [illegible]."[50] The only ray of hope he saw in contemporary science was the fact that the human mind was certain the key to [illegible] against being asked to be content "with minute [illegible] [illegible] the five senses helped by instruments."[51] One of his most [illegible] criticisms concerned the [illegible] of the scientist:

---

48. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], p. [illegible].

49. Shedd, "[illegible], [illegible]," [illegible] Review, I (January [illegible]), 12-14.

50. Shedd, "Comparative Certainty of Physics and Metaphysics," The Presbyterian Review, III (August 1882), 3.

51. Shedd, "[illegible] . . . ," Op. cit., p. 55.

> The man who holds one eye to the orifice of a microscope and keeps the other closely shut can not see anything beyond his nose and his knowledge must be confined to a very small circumference. He may be able to tell us how many scales there are in an inch of a fishes skin and how many fibres there are in a spot on a butterfly's wing. But, such minute physical inquiries as these leave him no time nor taste for higher and grander matters.[52]

Shedd's scorn for absorption in physical things was broadened to include all who sought less than a spiritual interpretation of the universe. He believed this was what was clearly represented by those who held to and proclaimed the theory of evolution. However, since he didn't expect those who adhered to that theory to pay such a criticism any attention, he heaped upon them a criticism which he believed struck them at a point they would have to recognize as vulnerable:

> The discussion respecting the scientific value of the theory of evolution which makes all the phenomena of the mineral, vegetable, animal, and rational kingdoms to be alike the mechanical motion of molecules of matter, have overlooked the fact that it has no foundation or support in mathematics. A really mechanical force and motion can be investigated and enunciated arithmetically and algebraically.[53]

His conclusion on the materialistic science of his day was simply that it had become so committed to its own singular and improbable theories that it no longer thought it necessary to rely upon accepted and respected order of proof.

---

52. Shedd, "Hume . . . ," op. cit., p. 32.

53. Shedd, "Materialist Physics Unmathematical," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, II (April 1891), 323.

Shedd was likewise critical of the philosophy of his times. That form of philosophy which troubled him most was that type which masqueraded as high religion, but which he regarded as infidelity. He said:

Unbelief does not now adopt the open, and comparatively manly method of the last century. The English deists did not pretend to be Christians, but attacked Christianity with all their force. The French infidels did the same, only with more virulence and hatred. But the infidel of the present day claims to be only a more philosophic and advanced Christian. Skepticism now represents itself as the refinement, and inmost essence, of Christianity. The infidel schools in England and America deny the charge of unbelief. They affirm that they are themselves the highest of believers, and have a mission to lift up the general mass of Christians to a higher, even the highest religious position. Their system does not contain so much truth as that of the English deists, neither is it as consistently constructed, nor as clearly expressed; but instead of allowing it to pass for what it is, these pantheistic and materializing skeptics attempt to palm it off as the permanent residuum of truth, after the Biblical and ecclesiastical elements have been purged out, as dross.[54]

Shedd felt that America, having already lost much, and in the midst of national decay, surely need not look to her philosophers for help. In philosophy, as elsewhere, Shedd was of the opinion that "yesterday was better."

For that matter, America need not look to the "present generation of Christians" for they are "too busy to be highly religious."[55] Shedd could find nothing good in the hustle and hurry of the world of his day. So far as he was concerned,

---

54. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, p. 418.

55. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 243.

Shaw was likewise critical of the philosophy of his time. That form of philosophy which troubled him most was that type which [illegible] as [illegible], but which he regarded as infidelity. He said:

> [illegible] now [illegible] the [illegible], and [illegible] method of the last century. The English deists did not pretend to be Christians, but attacked Christianity with all their [illegible]. The French infidels did the same, only with more [illegible]. But the infidel of the present day wishes to be only a more philosophic and advanced Christian. [illegible] now represents [illegible] as the [illegible], and [illegible], of Christianity. [illegible] deny [illegible] of Christianity. [illegible] that they [illegible] themselves [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] to lift [illegible] general mass of Christians to a [illegible] philosophical position. Their system does not [illegible] as that of [illegible], [illegible] as [illegible]; but instead of allowing it to pass for what it is, [illegible] and materialising skeptics attempt to pass it off as the genuine [illegible] of truth, after the [illegible] and [illegible] elements have been purged out, as dross.[44]

Shaw felt that America, owing [illegible] lost much, but in the midst of national decay, [illegible] need not look to her philosophers for help. In philosophy, as elsewhere, [illegible] was of the opinion that "yesterday was better."

For that matter, America need not look to the "recent (conception of [illegible]" for they are "too [illegible] to be mighty [illegible]."[45] Shaw could find nothing good in the [illegible] of the world of his day. So far as he was concerned,

---

44. [illegible], [illegible], p. [illegible].

45. [illegible], [illegible], p. [illegible].

the completeness with which the American Christian gave himself to his business pursuits was, in itself, a guarantee that he would not cultivate the religious life which thrives upon meditation and leisurely study. When asked "whence cometh this preoccupation with business?" Shedd's answer was: "The love of money is the root of much of the evil that is now afflicting the Church of Christ."[56]

Underlying all of these criticisms of life in his times was Shedd's belief that men were sure to err in their ways so long as they did not "know themselves." And, whatever Socrates may have had in mind when he said "Know thyself," Shedd believed that it meant "Know thyself a sinner. Know what sin really is. Then look to God for the atonement He has provided." In the Preface to Sermons to the Natural Man, Shedd makes it clear that underlying all the other sicknesses of life there was this fundamental sickness: Men did not know themselves.

> The discouraging religious condition of the present age is due to the great lack, not merely in the lower, but the higher classes as well, of calm, clear, self-intelligence. Men do not know themselves.[57]
>
> A certain class has been plied with the doctrine of a natural virtue and an innate goodness until it has become proud and self-reliant. The 'manhood' of paganism is glorified and the 'childhood' of the Gospel is vilified. The graces of humility,

---

56. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 244.

57. Shedd, Wm. G. T., Sermons to the Natural Man (New York, 1873), p. ix.

> self-abasement before God, and especially of penitence for sin, are distasteful and loathed. . . . It is therefore especially incumbent upon the Christian ministry to employ a searching and psychological style of preaching and apply the tests of ethics and virtue so powerfully to men who are trusting in ethics and virtue, as to bring them upon their knees.[58]

What Shedd stated to be his purpose in the Preface, he labored to do in each and every one of the sermons in this volume. The sameness of his emphasis, and the zeal with which he makes it, can be accounted for only by the fact that he felt that there was no hope for man in any of his activities unless man came to recognize himself a sinner.

This, of course, means that Shedd's chief criticism of his times was that the religion of that day was a false religion. And, it was for the false and misleading elements in contemporary religion, and those who spread them, that Shedd reserved his most thorough criticism. With these criticisms he sought to unmask error and pave the way for truth which alone was able to counteract the "furious fermentation" which was bringing society closer and closer to "dissolution."

The tendency for an increasing number of American scholars and churchmen to accept the pronouncements of Continental Biblical critics was viewed with alarm and regret by Shedd. Whereas, for some, Coleridge's position regarding the inspiration of Holy Scripture was a wholesome "breath of fresh air"

---

58. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, p. viii.

and a genuine contribution to the religious thought of the day, it was for Shedd something to be highly regretted:

We regard it as an error in him, that the Canon is not contemplated as a complete whole in and by itself, having a common origin in the Divine Mind, in such sense, that as a body of information it is infallibly correct on all the subjects that come within its scope and purpose.[59]

This was the position which Shedd held throughout his life. And, on this subject, Shedd became a polemicist. Whereas, during the years that he was professor of Biblical Studies he wrote and published works on history and theology, during his later years as professor of Systematic Theology, he felt called to write many articles upon Biblical Criticism. In these writings he gave belittling names to those who thought other than that which he believed to be the "historical and true pattern of thought" concerning the Scriptures. He termed the opposition "Conjectural Critics" and wrote against their "pseudo-Critical views."[60] In addition to his writing, he associated himself with that group, mostly Princeton

---

59. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 56.

60. Shedd, "Two Views of the Old Testament," Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 112 ff. See also the companion article, "Conjectural Criticism," which follows upon the above. See also: "The Westminster Affirmation of the Original Inerrancy of the Scriptures," Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, pp. 140-145; Shedd, Wm. G. T., Review of "The Miraculous Element in the Gospels," by A. B. Bruce, Presbyterian Review, VIII (January 1887), 163-166; and Shedd, Wm. G. T., "How Were the Four Gospels Composed?" Presbyterian and Reformed Review, IV (July 1893), 441-449.

and a [illegible] to the religious [illegible] of the day, it was the [illegible] shocking, to be highly [illegible]:

> It becomes an error in kind, that the Canon is not contemplated as a complete whole in and by itself, [illegible] one origin in the Divine mind, [illegible] of inspiration it is inerrantly correct on all the subjects that come within its scope and purpose.[59]

This was the position which Shedd held throughout his life. And, on this subject, Shedd became a polemicist. [illegible], during the years that he was professor of Biblical studies [illegible] and published works on history and theology, during his [illegible] years as professor of systematic theology, he felt called to write many articles upon Biblical criticism. In these writings he gave [illegible] names to those who brought other than that which he believed to be the "traditional and true pattern of thought" concerning the Scriptures. He [illegible] "conjectural critics" and wrote against their "pseudo-critical views."[60] In addition to his writings, he [illegible] himself with that group, mostly Princeton

---

59. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of [illegible], I, [illegible].

60. Shedd, "Two Views of the Old Testament," Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 112 ff. See also the companion article, "Conjectural Criticism," which follows upon the above. See also: [illegible] of the Scriptures," Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, pp. [illegible]; Shedd, W. G. T., "Review of [illegible] in the Gospels," by A. B. Bruce, Presbyterian Review, III (Jan. 1882), 159-160; and Shedd, W. G. T., "How Were the Four Gospels Composed?" Presbyterian and Reformed Review, IV (July 1893), 441-449.

professors, who sought to remove Charles A. Briggs from the faculty of Union Theological Seminary because of his "dangerous and heretical views" concerning the Scriptures. This action, which took place after Shedd himself had become professor emeritus, succeeded in driving both Briggs and Union Theological Seminary from full fellowship with the Presbyterian Church and probably did more to publicize and further "higher criticism" than it did to decrease its power and influence.[61]

Shedd declared that these "conjectural critics" relied chiefly upon "the inventiveness and ingenuity of their own intellects"[62] and did so "in order to force the Scriptures into the service of anti-supernaturalism and infidelity."[62]

Back of these declarations, made with vigor, was the belief that any deviation whatever from the theory of inspiration which he held to be the traditional view, was a deviation in the direction of complete surrender of the doctrine of inspiration, and, as a consequence, the surrender of Christian belief in the credibility of Scriptures. He insisted that "Christian apologetes assume that if it could be proved incontrovertibly that a particular book was not written by, or under the guidance of, a prophet or apostle, it is not

---

61. Loetscher, L. A., The Broadening Church (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 48-62. See also Slosser, G. J., editor, They Seek a Country (New York, 1955), pp. 3-4.

62. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 131-132.

inspired."[63] He called attention to the fact that ". . . in revealed religion, the credibility of a doctrine depends upon its source, as well as upon its nature and contents."[64] Inspiration, Shedd said, "was always bestowed upon a particular known person, and is so represented."[65]

> If the Bible can not be proved to be written by the prophets and apostles, it can not be proved to be inspired at all; because it can not be proved that there were ever any human beings whatever, excepting these prophets and apostles, that were 'moved by the Holy Ghost'.[66]

Thus, though Shedd was at odds with the whole general movement of American theological thought, he believed himself to be battling against a theological sickness which could lead but to the death of orthodoxy, and, in the end, of Christianity itself.

An even greater amount of his polemic criticism was reserved for those in the Presbyterian Church who were seeking to revise the Westminster Confession. So dangerous did he believe this movement to be that he took to the secular press and the denominational papers to carry on his fight against revision. Any attempt to revise the Westminster Standards was viewed by Shedd as "an attempt to mix something else with

---

63. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 139.

64. Ibid., p. 138. 65. Ibid., p. 134.

66. Ibid., p. 140.

[illegible] called attention to the fact that ". . . in revealed religion, the credibility of a doctrine depends upon its [illegible]." [illegible], [illegible] said, "was always bestowed upon a particular [illegible], and is so represented."

If the Bible can not be proved to be written by the prophets and [illegible], it can not be proved to be inspired at all; because it can not be proved that there were ever any inspired beings whatever, excepting those prophets and apostles, that were [illegible]

Thus, [illegible] was one [illegible] general [illegible] of American theological thought, he [illegible] to be battling against a theological [illegible] which could lead but to the death of orthodoxy, and, in the end, of Christianity itself.

An [illegible] in the Presbyterian Church who were seeking to revise the Westminster Confession. So dangerous did he believe this movement to be that he took to the secular press and the denominational papers to carry on his fight against revision. Any attempt to revise the Westminster Standards was viewed by [illegible] as "an attempt to mix something else with

---

[illegible]

Calvinism." This would be the "destruction of that self-consistency which is the necessary constituent of true science, and indispensible to permanent power and influence."[67]

Furthermore, Shedd believed that the history of "the revision movements" revealed two dangerous facts: the revision of a creed is latitudinarian in its nature and influence, and doctrinal modification is an inclined plane.[68] Therefore, it was a source of hurt to him when it became evident that a large number (134) of the presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were ready for the Assembly to send down recommendations concerning revision of the Westminster Standards. His hurt was partially relieved when not a single one of the twenty-eight overtures sent down by the General Assembly to the presbyteries received enough votes to make revision a fact.[69]

During this period in the life of the Church, Shedd circulated two articles, "Revision is Inexpedient," and "Revision is Objectionable."[70] In addition, he wrote and published careful studies of those points in the Westminster Confession

---

67. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, Preface, p. v.

68. Ibid., pp. iv, vi.

69. Thompson, History of the Presbyterian Churches, pp. 254-256.

70. Shedd, Reprints from New York Evangelist, September 5, 1889, and Northwestern Presbyterian, November 23, 1889, published as essays I and II in Calvinism: Pure and Mixed.

Calvinism.[67] This would be the "destruction of that self-consistency which is the necessary constituent of true science, and [illegible] to permanent power and influence."[68]

[illegible], also, believed that the history of "the [illegible]" revealed two dangerous facts: the revision of a creed is [illegible] in its nature and in its [illegible], and [illegible] modification is an inevitable result.[69] Therefore, it was a source of hurt to him when it became evident that a large number (...) of the presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were ready for the Assembly to send [illegible]. [illegible] hurt was partially relieved when not a single one of the twenty-eight overtures sent down by the General Assembly to the presbyteries received enough votes to make [illegible].[70]

During this period in the life of the Church, [illegible] two articles, "Revision is inexpedient," and "[illegible] is [illegible]."[71] In addition, he wrote and published [illegible] of these points in the [illegible]

---

67. [illegible]

68. [illegible]

69. [illegible]

70. [illegible]

which were most under attack. These he not only defended, but also contended that they did not mean at all what their detractors had interpreted them to mean.[71] In so doing, Shedd wrote some of his bitterest words, of which the following are an example:

The present attack upon the Calvinistic creed by the so-called "liberal" and "progressive" parties in Protestantism, is an example of the zeal of liberal bigotry. . . . The zeal which they exhibit in opposition to this intellectual and powerful theology is as unintelligent and passionate as anything to be found in any annals whatever. And, what is worse, it is an unscrupulous zeal not seen among the orthodox. When did the orthodox ever stoop to the method of the "liberal" theologian? When did Calvinists ever attempt to sap and destroy "progressive" theology, by the plan recommended by some "progressive" theologians for sapping and destroying the Calvinistic faith: the plan of remaining in a denomination after changing one's belief and trying to subvert the creed of the denomination? What Calvinists ever advised Calvinists publicly to subscribe to an anti-Calvinistic creed, and then teach and defend Calvinism within an anti-Calvinistic denomination? What Calvinist ever advised Calvinists to hold office and take emoluments on anti-Calvinistic foundations? What orthodox body has ever put to its own use endowments that were given for the spread of "progressive" theology? The history of religious endowments shows, without exception, if we are not mistaken, that it is the looser creed that filches from the stricter, not the stricter from the looser.[72]

Such language makes it clear that Shedd could never recommend the "revisionists," the "compromisers," the "liberals," or the "progressives," among the religious leaders, as helpers

---

71. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, essays III, IV, VI, and VIII.

72. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 172-173.

while many will [illegible]. [illegible], but also understand that they [illegible] practice and interpreted [illegible].[14] [illegible] truly make of his [illegible], of [illegible] as [illegible]:

> The present attack upon the [illegible] by the so-called "liberals" and "progressive" [illegible] in Protestantism, is an example of the zeal of liberal bigotry. . . . The [illegible] they exhibit in opposition to this intellectual and positive [illegible] is as unintelligent and [illegible] to be found in any annals whatever. [illegible], it is an [illegible] not seen [illegible]. [illegible] "liberal" [illegible] than the [illegible] ever [illegible] and [illegible] "[illegible] tive" theology, by [illegible] some "progressive" theologians [illegible] the plan of [illegible] belief and trying to [illegible] were [illegible] to an anti-[illegible] creed, and [illegible] [illegible] an anti-[illegible] ist were [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] as anti-[illegible] put in its [illegible] which were given for the [illegible] of "progressive" theology. The [illegible] of religious [illegible], without exception, it [illegible] it is the [illegible] creed that [illegible] the stricter, not the stricter from the looser.[15]

[illegible] since it [illegible] from the "revisionists," the "[illegible]," the "liberals," in the "progressives," among the religious leaders, as [illegible]

---

14. [illegible], *[illegible]*, [illegible].

15. [illegible], *[illegible]*, [illegible].

in the needed task of stopping national decay. They were part of the sickness!

Although William G. T. Shedd was not alone in his criticism of the life of his times, he did not align himself with that growing body of critics who sought to reform the society which merited criticism. The story of this body of social critics forms the exciting beginning of what has come to be recognized as "the Social Gospel Movement in America." But, Shedd was as critical of this group of men as he was of the society which both he and they criticized. As early as 1852-1853, when he was teaching homiletics in Auburn, he was seeking to point out this error within the Church. He urged his students to avoid the error of making a direct effort to "elevate society." The minister, he taught, is not called to "watch over all the special interests of social, literary, political, and economical life."[73] Then, following a brief elaboration of this statement, he turned to what we have already recognized to be his favorite theme, and said:

> That minister who limits himself, in his Sabbath discourses, to the exhibition and enforcement of the doctrines of sin and grace, and whose preaching results in the actual conversion of human beings, contributes far more, in the long run, to the progress of society.[74]

---

73. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 248-249.

74. Ibid., p. 248.

By 1855, when Shedd spoke before the American Education Society, it was not enough to urge the ministry to sink all themes in the one theme of the Cross. By that time Shedd believed that a direct approach to the "elevation of society" was dangerous and should be attacked as a danger. To that group of educators, he said:

> . . . is it not natural to query whether even the mind of the Church has not been too much distracted by that large and important class of subjects which fall within the sphere of Ethics, as distinguished from that of Christianity? Whether the whole great subject of Reform has not been made to yield up such a mass of topics, and such an influx of ideas and sentiments, as to deluge the mind, and leave no room for the distinctively religious topics of sin and guilt, of atonement and regeneration, of faith and repentance, of hope and of love? Has not this variety of topics and of information, drawn from the ethical rather than the evangelical domain, brought the public mind into such a confused condition, that it needs, more than ever, to be brought back to the few and simple truths of the gospel and godliness? How is this to be done? . . . . By such a clear, bold, and penetrating statement of the truth that slays, and the truth that makes alive, is the altered mood and tendency to be brought about in the public mind.[75]

Shedd speaks of the "truth that slays and makes alive" because he believed that much that passed under the guise of reform was but infidelity, and was therefore in need of being slain. He described this "social reform infidelity" in these terms:

---

75. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 369.

By [illegible], [illegible]

society, it was not enough to urge the ministry to sink all themes in the one theme of the cross. By that time Snead believed that a direct approach to the "elevation of society" was dangerous and should be attacked as a danger. To that group of ministers, he said:

> . . . it is not unnatural to query whether even the mind of the church has not been too much distracted by that large and important class of subjects which fall within the sphere of ethics, as distinguished from those of Christianity? Whether the whole [illegible] subject of reform has not been made to place [illegible] of topics, and such an influx of ideas and sentiments, as to deluge the mind, and leave no room for the distinctively religious topics of sin and guilt, of atonement and regeneration, of faith and repentance, of hope and of love? [illegible] [illegible] the ethical rather than the evangelical element, brought the public mind into such a critical condition, that it needs, more than ever, to be brought back to the few and simple truths of the gospel and godliness? How is this to be done? . . . . By such a clear, bold, and unswerving statement of the truths that slays, and the truth that makes alive, in the [illegible] mood and tendency to be brought about in the public mind.13

Snead speaks of the "truth that slays and makes alive" because he believed that much that passed under the guise of reform was but infidelity, and was therefore in need of being slain. [illegible]

[illegible]

13. Snead, [illegible], p. [illegible].

A class of minds are loudly proclaiming the truth of ethics and natural religion, from beneath the sounding-board of Reform, for whom the doctrine of the cross is a most hateful offence, and whose temper towards those peculiar truths which are the life and life-blood of the Christian Religion, is marked by a malignity and a virulence, which finds its parallel only in the first and original "generation of vipers."[76]

To this condemnation, Shedd added the following constructive words:

Nothing but learning in the clergy can overmaster this error. Nothing but broad scholarship, profound insight, and power of distinct statement can exhibit the true functions of both Ethics and the Gospel, and carry the public mind against the half-understanding of the enemy of Christianity and its covert attack.[77]

This study of the criticism which Shedd leveled against the institutions and leadership of his times, brings us to substantially the same point we arrived at through a study of his own appreciation of his calling. His positive calling was to proclaim and defend that clear, bold, and penetrating statement of the truth which Augustine and Calvin formulated out of the Scriptures. This is just the kind of thing which "broad Scholarship, profound insight, and the power of distinct statement would exhibit before the public mind and thus defeat the enemies of Christianity." Shedd knew that this was a task of "calling men back." But he believed that it was the way back to that which alone could arrest the decay

---

76. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 373.

77. Ibid., p. 374.

that he saw everywhere evident. He further believed that it was the way back to that which alone would restore the Church to its proper place in the life of civilization. Both his assessment of the needs of his times and his "daily and nightly communion with a noble army of theologians," confirmed in Shedd a single aim:

> . . . to justify and defend before the human understanding, that intellectual and powerful system of theology which had its origin in the Biblical studies and personal experiences of the two most comprehensive and scientific theologians of Christendom: Aurelius Augustine and John Calvin.[78]

It is this justification and defense which is expounded and examined in the pages which follow.

---

78. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, Preface, p. vii.

Chapter II

REVELATION: NATURAL AND BIBLICAL

1. The Resource of Natural Reason

Shedd had his reasons for giving high praise to the Puritan "spirituality of mind" which was able "to realize the supernatural without the aid of visible things."[1] He also had reasons for hoping for a rebellion against the scientists' "uncommon absorption in physical objects and problems"[2] and their willingness to be content with "minute observations of the five senses, helped by instruments."[3] Shedd simply did not believe that the "visible things of the world" or the

---

1. Shedd, Literary Essays, p. 234.

2. Shedd, "Comparative Certainty of Physics and Metaphysics," Presbyterian Review, III, 3.

3. Shedd, "Hume, Huxley, On Miracles," Presbyterian Review, I, 33.

"things known by sense perception," could possibly bring men certain knowledge. Shedd was not interested in any other type of knowledge. He was preoccupied with certainty.

Shedd defined certainty as that which follows upon knowledge of "a priori" and "necessary" truth.[4] He interpreted Kant as saying that sense perception can never arrive at such truth, and hence, can never arrive at certainty.[5] It was on this basis that Shedd wrote his article, "Comparative Certainty of Physics and Metaphysics," which he believed to be so definitive of his views on the subject that when he published his major work, Dogmatic Theology, he reprinted this earlier article, *in toto*, as his way of introducing his views of "Theology, an Absolute Science."[6] The position which he took in this article was not new to him. It was then but an enlargement of what he had written in 1868 in the "Introductory Essay" to his edition of The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. At that time he wrote that "an absolute knowledge, true intrinsically, and irrespective of the subjective laws of human intelligence, is impossible within the sphere of the Natural and the Sensuous."[7] It was "absolute

---

4. Shedd, "Comparative Certainty," *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 7,13.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

6. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 29-45.

7. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 29-31.

knowledge" or "certainty" which Shedd sought, and truth of this sort was not conveyed through the world of sense-perception.

Having thus dispensed with physical sensation and outward sensuous observation as a way to certainty, Shedd began to defend metaphysics as a way to that knowledge which gave certainty. Metaphysics, as he used the term, was concerned with the investigation and appreciation of mind and its phenomena. Shedd held that "in the world of mind, all those principles which constitute knowledge are to be sought for. They lie in the structure of mind . . . ."[8] And--

> Mind is reason and reason is marked by immutable and necessary qualities. When God creates a rational being He makes him after His own image. This makes reason one and invariable in its essential properties. All finite reason must resemble the Infinite Reason in kind. When God creates a rational spirit, He must, from the nature of the case, make it after His own likeness and after no other pattern.[9]

In so emphasizing reason as marked by unchangeable and necessary qualities, and as a bond of affinity between the human spirit and the Divine Spirit,[10] Shedd believed that he was continuing that method of philosophizing which is historically called Platonic, which had always showed affinity with

---

8. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 25.

9. Shedd, "Comparative Certainty," op. cit., p. 6.

10. Shedd, "The Ontological Argument for Divine Existence," The Presbyterian Review, V (April 1884), 227.

Christianity,[11] and which he believed was to be regarded as "substantial with the very essence of learning; a system which for insight into ultimate principles is at the head of all human knowledge."[12]

Certainty was available for man, not only through investigation of the mental structure of man, but also through investigation of the moral structure of man. Here Shedd was a follower of Kant, Cudworth, and Coleridge. He believed that the moral or practical reason, as set forth in Kant's system, was "reason in its highest and substantive form, and no decisions of any other faculty of the human soul have such absolute authority as those of this faculty."[13] The judgments of this practical reason are given in conscience, and "this faculty has an authority for man that can not be accounted for, except by its being the voice of God."[14]

The moral reason and conscience, the moral reason as containing for its substance and inlay the moral law of God and the conscience as the faculty that testifies with respect to the harmony or the hostility of the will with this law--these are a part of that "image and likeness to God" after which man was originally created. These faculties have to do with what is religious, ethical, eternal; and notwithstanding the

---

11. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 36.

12. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 26-27.

13. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 30-31.

14. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 63-64.

certainty,[11] and which he believed was to be regarded as "axiomatic with the very essence of knowing; a [illegible] into the inquiry into ultimate principles is at the root of all human knowledge."[12]

Certainty was available for man, not only through investigation of the mental structure of man, but also through investigation of the moral structure of man. Here [illegible] was a follower of Kant, [illegible], and Coleridge. He believed that the moral or practical reason, as set forth in Kant's system, was "reason in its highest and essential form, and the [illegible] of any other faculty of the human soul have such conclusive authority as those of this faculty."[13] The judgments of this practical reason are given in conscience, and "this faculty has an authority for man that can not be accounted for, except by its being the voice of God."[14]

The moral sense and conscience, the moral reason as contemplating [illegible] and [illegible], the moral law of God and the [illegible] in the faculty that testifies with respect to the [illegible] of the freedom of the will with this law--these are a part of that "life and likeness to God" after which man was originally created. These faculties have to do with what is religious, ethical, eternal; and [illegible] the

---

11. [illegible], "Introductory Essay," Works of [illegible], I, [illegible].

12. [illegible], [illegible], pp. [illegible].

13. [illegible], "Introductory [illegible]," [illegible], I, [illegible].

14. [illegible], [illegible], [illegible].

apostasy and corruption of men's heart and will they still constitute a point of connection and communication between the being of man and the being of God. The moral reason and conscience are the intellectual media whereby, if we may so speak, man and his Maker, are put "en rapport."[15]

Here, then, is the fundamental basis for "natural revelation" as it was understood by Shedd. And, having followed him thus far, it is easy to understand his definitive statement concerning revelation, a statement containing his appreciation of both natural and Biblical revelation. This statement reads:

Two great communications have been made to man: the one in the book of nature, and the other in the book of revelation. If the truth has been conveyed through the mental and moral structure, if it has been wrought by the creative hand into the fabric of human nature, than he is the most original thinker who is most successful in reading it just as it reads, and expounding it just as it stands. If the truth has been communicated by miracle, by incarnation, and by the Holy Ghost; if it has been imparted by special inspiration and lies before him an objective and written revelation; then he is the original thinker who is most successful in its interpretation--who is most accurate in analyzing its living elements, and is most genial and cordial in receiving them into his own mental and moral being.[16]

The very mental and moral structure of human nature makes natural religion possible. Natural religion is constructed "a priori" out of the truths of man's mental and moral constitution.[17] The man who is sensitive to the "immutable and

15. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 274-275.

16. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 10-11.

17. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 219-220.

[illegible] of man's heart and will they, [illegible] a point of contact [illegible] the being of [illegible] [illegible] put "[illegible]."[9]

[illegible], then, is the fundamental basis for "natural revela-tion" as it was understood by [illegible]. [illegible], having followed him thus far, it is easy to understand his definition of [illegible] revelation, a statement [illegible] natural and Biblical revelation. This state-ment reads:

> The great [illegible] have been made to [illegible]: the one is [illegible] the other is [illegible]. [illegible] has been [illegible] through [illegible], it has been wrought by the [illegible] into the [illegible] nature, [illegible] original [illegible] is most successful in reading it just as it stands. [illegible] by miracle, by [illegible], and by the [illegible] been [illegible] by special inspiration and [illegible] an objective and written revelation; [illegible] is most successful in the [illegible] is most accurate in [illegible] ele-ments, and is most [illegible] and [illegible] in [illegible] them into [illegible].[10]

[illegible] natural religion possible. [illegible][11]

---

9. [illegible]

10. [illegible]

11. [illegible]

necessary principles" of human reason, and to the "immutable morality" wrought into the human moral constitution, will be possessed of a natural religion which is a Divine communication.[18]

However, natural religion is insufficient to meet man's needs. It is insufficient, in the first place, because it is devoid of the power necessary for the renovation of human nature. "More than a rule is needed . . . . A disposition to obey the rule needs be imparted."[19] Natural religion can not impart this needed disposition to obey. In truth, Shedd found convincing evidence of the fact that humanity is at odds with itself in the fact that "a Plato, a Plutarch, and a Cicero" found right ideas of ethics and natural religion in man's reason, but also found that these right ideas were "not obeyed and realized in man's will."[20] The first insufficiency of natural religion is that it knows of no mode of deliverance from inability to do what is known to be right.

In the second place, natural religion is insufficient to meet man's need for answers to the perplexing questions of life. Typical of these questions are those having to do with the real nature of God, the origin of sin and evil, the resurrection of the body, and whether or not there is mercy and

---

18. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 274-275, and Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 11-12.

19. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 374-375.

20. Ibid., p. 378.

prevailing [illegible] morality [illegible] grafted [illegible] tion.

Seventh, [illegible] needs. It is [illegible] levels of [illegible] tions. [illegible] away the [illegible] support this [illegible] containing [illegible] itself in [illegible] twentieth [illegible] prayer, [illegible] and [illegible] natural [illegible] than [illegible]

In the [illegible] that [illegible] life. [illegible] the real [illegible] mediation [illegible]

[illegible]

pity in the heart of God.[21] It is precisely at this latter point that natural religion, according to Shedd, most obviously fails. Natural religion can assure man of God's condemnation of sin, and of the sinner. It can do this because there is a correspondence between the judicial nature of man and the judicial nature of God.[22] This is why natural religion can manifest the justice of God and inspire fear. But, because natural religion knows nothing of the mercy of God or of Divine compassion, it is insufficient.[23]

That natural religion is insufficient, however, in no way suggests that it is worthless. It is a Divine communication, and therefore of value. And, as the whole emphasis of Sermons to the Natural Man suggests, the value of natural religion lies in its power to awaken man to the claims of God upon him and to quicken in man a hope that there is mercy with God. Thus, the first Divine communication, that which is conveyed through the mental and moral structure of man, is preparation for the second Divine communication, which is written revelation.

---

21. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, p. 29.

22. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 276.

23. Ibid., p. 217.

with the sense of God.[41] ... It is admitted by most theolo-
gians that natural religion, according to Shedd, most cru-
cially fails. Natural religion can assure man of God's condem-
nation of sin, and of the sinner. It can do this because
there is a correspondence between the judicial nature of man
and the judicial nature of God.[42] This is why natural reli-
gion can manifest the justice of God and inspire fear. But,
because natural religion knows nothing of the mercy of God or
of Divine compassion, it is insufficient.[43]

That natural religion is insufficient, however, in no way suggests that it is worthless. It is a divine communication, and therefore of value. And, as the whole emphasis of Sermons to the Natural Man suggests, the value of natural religion lies in its power to awaken men to the claims of God upon him and to quicken in him a hope that there is mercy with God. Thus, the first divine communication, that which is conveyed through the mental and moral structure of man, is preparation for the second divine communication, which is written revelation.

---

41. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, p. 2.
42. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 47.
43. Ibid., p. 47.

2. The Biblical Revelation

When Shedd speaks of that revelation which supplies that which it is necessary to know if the insufficiencies of natural religion are to be made up, he speaks of it as "denoting the communication of truth or facts hitherto unknown to man, and incapable of being deduced from the structures of the human intellect, or derived through the ordinary channels of human information."[24] Revelation, in this sense, does not consist of principles which can be known by reasoning, but consists of particular truths, historical truths, such truths as must be made known to man by testimony.[25] And, it is this historical character of the truths of the revelation which necessitates that revelation be "a record." Shedd, therefore, declared:

> Whereas God must be just, and truthful, He need not be merciful. The exercise of mercy is voluntary--always optional, never necessary. . . . Hence, the religion of mercy and redemption is historical and promissory in its nature. It contains a testimony respecting God's actual decision and purpose concerning the exercise of mercy. It is a record authenticated and certified of what God had decided and covenanted to do in a given case; and not a deduction from an "a priori" principle of what He must do of necessity. . . . The religion of mercy and redemption can be constructed only out of a special revelation from God.[26]

---

24. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 77.

25. Ibid., pp. 60-61.

26. Ibid., pp. 219-220.

4. The [illegible]

When Hume speaks of that revelation which supplies [illegible] is necessary to know if the [illegible] of natural religion are to be made up, he speaks of it as "[illegible] the communication of truth or facts not known to man, and incapable of being deduced from the [illegible] of the human intellect, or received through the ordinary channels of human information."[24] Revelation, in this sense, does not consist of principles which can be known by reason, but consists of particular [illegible] which [illegible] known to man by testimony.[25] [illegible] It is this historical character of the truths of the revelation which necessitates that revelation be "a [illegible]," [illegible]

[illegible] must be just, [illegible] not be [illegible]ful. The exercise of mercy is voluntary,--always optional, never necessary. . . . Hence, the [illegible] of mercy and re[illegible] is historical and [illegible] in its nature. It [illegible] a testimony respecting [illegible] actual decisions and [illegible] concerning the exercise of mercy. It is a record [illegible] of what [illegible] has decided and determined to do in a given case; and not a deduction from an "a priori" principle of what he must do of necessity. . . . The [illegible] of mercy and redemption can [illegible] only, out of a special revelation from God.[26]

---

24. Hume, [illegible], p. [illegible]

25. Ibid., pp. [illegible]

26. Ibid., pp. [illegible]

This special revelation from God, Shedd declared, must, of necessity, "be fixed in a written form" in order that it be exempt from liability to corruption and alteration from the fluctuations of human consciousness.[27] It is only as it is "written" that it can be, as Shedd described it, "objective."

Shedd admitted that this insistence upon the "written record" was historically developed in the polemic period of the Church's first centuries. He even said that "through the stricter definition and limitation of the idea of Revelation, and partly through the felt need in time of controversy, for some infallible standard of appeal," the apologists urged and established the authoritative character of the Scriptures.[28] It is to these apologists of that polemic period of the Church's early centuries that the Church owes this particular joining of revelation, inspiration, and the written record. The power of this historically developed position, lies in the insistence that this communication of truth, as written, was by direct inspiration of God.[29] Not only is this work of the apologists commended, but Shedd adds the following concerning inspiration: "Inspiration is a superhuman influence

---

27. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, I, 134, 137. See again, Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 10-11.

28. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, I, 150, 134.

29. Ibid., pp. 134, 137.

upon the particular person selected to be the organ of the Divine Mind. Inspiration insures freedom from error in presenting the truth."[30] This means that:

> The revelation of God in His written word must begin in a miracle. The truths and facts of revealed religion, as distinguished from natural, must be supernaturally communicated to a few particular persons, especially chosen for this purpose.[31]

The point of emphasis in this position obviously falls upon the miracle of inspiration which makes certain an infallible written revelation. In giving the extreme emphasis to this miracle of inspiration, Shedd aligned himself with Turretine, the elder, to whose works he acknowledged his indebtedness, and with the Princeton Theologians who were his contemporaries.

In maintaining his position that the "truths and facts of revealed religion must be supernaturally communicated to a few particular persons, especially chosen for this purpose," he vigorously defended the traditional views concerning the authorship of the various books of the Bible.[32] He challenged the critics who suggested that the Gospels were the compilation of oral tradition and not the literary work of

---

30. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 70.

31. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy (New York, 1893), p. 140.

32. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 112-140.

upon the particular person selected to be the organ of the divine mind. [illegible] implying [illegible].[30] This means that:

> The revelation of God in his written word must begin in a miracle. The truths and facts of revealed religion, as distinguished from natural, [illegible] to a few particular persons, especially chosen for this purpose.[31]

The point of emphasis in this position obviously falls upon the element of inspiration which makes certain an infallible written revelation. In giving the extreme emphasis to this element of inspiration, [illegible] aligned himself with [illegible], the elder, to whose works he acknowledged his indebtedness, and with the [illegible] theologians who were his contemporaries.

In maintaining his position that the "truths and facts of revealed religion must be superintendingly communicated to a few particular persons, especially chosen for this purpose," he vigorously defended the traditional views concerning the authorship of the various books of the Bible.[32] He challenged the critics who supposed that the Gospels were the compilation of oral tradition and not the literary work of

---

30. [illegible], [illegible], I, 8.

31. [illegible], [illegible] (New York, [illegible]), p. 145.

32. [illegible], [illegible], pp. [illegible].

those whose names have been linked with them by tradition.[33] He insisted that all attempts to attribute the writings in any portion of Holy Scripture to some person unnamed and unidentified was absurd. Furthermore, such a thing was dangerour since it was to take away the possibility of "proof" concerning that author's inclusion within the exclusive fellowship of the prophets and apostles. This was so important to Shedd because he believed that "an inspiration which can not be proved is worthless."[34] He even went so far as to assert that "If the Bible can not be proved to be written by the prophets and apostles, it can not be proved to be inspired at all."[35]

---

33. Shedd, "How Were the Four Gospels Composed?" The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, IV (July 1893), 461-469. See also: Shedd, review of "The Miraculous Element in the Gospels," by A. B. Bruce, The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, VIII (January 1867), 163-166.

34. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 134-139. See also: Shedd, "Professor Briggs' Inaugural Address," New York Observer (April 16, 1891), quoted in Briggs, The Bible, the Church, and the Reason (New York, 1892), pp. 130-131.

35. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 140. That Shedd represented the reigning point of view in the Presbyterian Church at that time is evidenced by the fact that in the years 1893 and 1894, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. found Professors Charles A. Briggs and Henry Preserved Smith guilty of "heresy." Included in the charges against each of these men was "teaching that Isaiah is not the author of the last 27 chapters of that book which bears his name." Briggs, The Study of Holy Scriptures (New York, 1899), pp. 288-289. See also: Coffin, H. S., Religion Yesterday and Today (Nashville, 1940), pp. 68-73.

[illegible].30

[illegible]

any particular book [illegible] to some person [illegible]

[illegible]. Furthermore, such a thing was only [illegible]

[illegible] it was to take away the possibility of "proof" co-

[illegible]

[illegible] prophets and apostles. This was so important to

[illegible] believed that "an inspiration which can not

be proved is worthless."34 He even went so far as to assert

[illegible] can not be proved to be written by the

prophets and apostles, it can not be proved to be in[illegible]

[illegible].35

31. [illegible], "How Are the Four Gospels Inspired?" The [illegible] and [illegible], IV ([illegible]), [illegible]. [illegible], The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, VIII (January 1897), 105-106.

34. [illegible], Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 134-1[illegible]. See [illegible] (April 1[illegible]), [illegible].

35. [illegible], p. 1[illegible]. That [illegible] represented the religious point of view in the Presbyterian [illegible] at that time is evidenced by the fact that in the years 1893 and 1894, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. found Professors Charles Briggs and Henry Preserved Smith guilty of "heresy." [illegible] in the charges against each of these men was "that [illegible] Isaiah is not the author of the last 27 chapters [illegible] bears his name." [illegible], pp. 20-[illegible]. [illegible]

Shedd was equally as vigorous in his denunciation of those who held to anything less than complete verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. He refuted the theory that only the "doctrines" of Scripture are infallible. This theory left room for "error" in such matters as geography, chronology, history, and the like.[36] Shedd said that in the first place, this theory sought to distinguish between the "solid doctrinal substance" in Scripture and the "secondary matters." Such a distinction, he held, could not be made because the two were impossible of separation.[37] In the second place, this view is less rational, Shedd contended, than the traditionally held verbal inspiration theory. It is less rational because--

> there must be truth somewhere in regard to all, even the most unimportant particulars of history, biography, and geography, that enter into the subject matter of the Sacred Canon, and it seems to us altogether the most rational . . . to presume and assume that it lies in the Canon itself--in the outward revelation considered as a finished and an infallible unity.[38]

Thus did Shedd seek to refute a theory of inspiration that was gaining adherents throughout Germany, England, and America.

---

36. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 74-76.

37. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 56-57.

38. Ibid. The portion omitted from this quotation is "in accordance with the general principle announced above" which principle was that inspiration is such an inbreathing of the human mind by the Holy Spirit as lifts that mind above its fallible condition. See also: Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 65.

He regarded Coleridge as one of the most able exponents of this theory and he considered it a grave error in the thought of Coleridge that he had refused to contemplate the whole of Scripture as a body of information, infallibly correct on all subjects.[39]

3. Historic Creeds and Revelation

Had Coleridge held the view of Scripture that Shedd believed that he should have, he would have then been able to have accomplished the thing needed to be done by the true philosopher-theologian, namely, bring the religious philosopher and theologian into contact with the two infallible sources of certainty: Divine revelation and Divine reason. Shedd believed that it was perhaps Coleridge's central contribution to the thought of his generation that he so ably defended and expounded the doctrines of Christianity on grounds of reason and philosophy. It was Coleridge who threw into an atmosphere which was becoming increasingly hostile toward Christianity, the challenging proclamation that the "scheme of Christianity, though not discoverable by human reason, is

39. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 56. On page 58 Shedd insists that only a proved error in the Scripture could be a valid objection to the verbal inspiration theory, and that "There is not a single case in which the absolute and unappealable settlement has resulted in establishing the fact of undoubted error."

yet in accordance with it."[40] It was Coleridge, Shedd believed, who convincingly set forth the truth that "all reflection upon the truths of Scripture ought to carry the mind down into deeper and deeper depths of its own being, and result in the most absolute and unassailable conviction that the Divine Revelation is likewise Divine Reason."[41] This was what Shedd believed to be the true task of the philosopher-theologian. He believed that the rationality of the Christian religion must be scientifically expressed, for--

> reasonableness and self-consistence are qualities . . . which belong to the intrinsic nature of Christianity. . . . Thus, whoever shows the inward necessity and reasonableness of a doctrine of Christianity, does, by that very act and fact show the harmony of philosophy and religion. Whoever takes a doctrine of Christianity and . . . derives out of the very elements of the doctrine and the very terms of the statement itself, a reasonableness that irresistibly commends itself to the spontaneous reason and instinctive judgment of universal man, by this very process demonstrates the inward, central, unity of faith and reason.[42]

Shedd found this process at work in the great Trinitarian controversies of the early Church. In fact, he believed that it was this particular epoch in the history of the Church which unmistakably established the fact, and the necessity of, a Christian philosophy. His argument here is so central to

---

40. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 36, 39.

41. Ibid., I, 39-40.

42. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 100-101. See also: Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 420-421.

an appreciation of his understanding of Christian philosophical theology that it is reproduced:

We are compelled to think that the Christian mind has never reached a deeper depth in metaphysical philosophy than that to which it was compelled to sink by the acute objections of Arianism and Sabellianism. Let anyone thoughtfully peruse the creeds that had their origin in these controversies, and see with what masterly care and ability the orthodox mind, in spite of all the imperfections of human language, strove to express the idea with which it was laboring, so as to avoid the Arian, the Sabellian, and the Tritheistic ideas of the Divine Nature, and then ask if there is not something of the mental, something of the rational, in the doctrine of the Trinity, by virtue of which it becomes a legitimate object of contemplation for the human mind, and to some extent, a guide to its inquiry. How could a man like Athanasius, for example, contend so earnestly, and with such truth of counter-statement, against a false idea, unless he had the true Idea somewhat clear in his own mind to contend for. And, if it be said that this was derived from the bare letter of the Scriptures, and that the whole controversy between the contending parties hinged upon the citation of proof texts, the question arises: how came Athanasius to see such a different truth in these texts from that which his opponents saw in them? . . . It must be recollected that the Scriptures do not furnish ready-formed, a systematic and scientific statement of the doctrine in question. How then came the orthodox mind to derive its own sharply-defined dogma from the Scriptures, and the heterodox mind its own equally sharply-defined dogma from the very same Scriptures, unless each brought an antecedent interpreting Idea into the controversy? . . . We do not by any means suppose that this orthodox idea of the Trinity sprang up in the orthodox mind at this particular instant in the history of the Church . . . . It was a slow formation. But, the doctrine of the Trinity was now an idea of the mind of the Church and therefore contained a mental element by virtue of which it was a legitimate object of rational contemplation, and not a mere letter upon the page of Scriptures.[43]

---

43. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 41-42.

We have now seen the theological mind, partly from its own impulse, and partly from the necessities of its position, first collate from the written word the various and scattered data there given, then combine them into a general statement as in the Apostles' Creed, and then expand them into a more special form of doctrine, as in the Nicene and Athanasian Symbols. Collation, Combination, and Expansion are the parts of the scientific process.[44]

Shedd believed that this was a pivotal and determinative period in Church history. What he had come to see in the doctrinal development of this period, he believed could be seen throughout the history of the Church. Therefore, he arrived at two conclusions which shaped his own understanding of the pathway to theological certainty. These two conclusions were: (1) the theologian should look for "that same comprehensive and approximately exhaustive development and realization of Scripture truth in the history of the Church which the philosopher hopes to find of the finite reason in the secular history of the race;"[45] and (2) "it is characteristic of the general mind of the Church; of the historic Christian mind; that it reproduces in its intuition and its statement, the complex and complete Scriptural idea."[46] Here is the basic pair of ideas which shaped Shedd's appreciation of the historic creeds of the Church.

---

44. Shedd, History of Doctrine, I, 373.

45. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 89-90.

46. Ibid., p. 94.

As a corollary to this two-fold belief in the necessity of such development, and in the satisfactory character of the development to be seen in Church history, Shedd asserted that the history of this development displayed a system of truth which was "as near to the infallibility of the written revelation as anything that is still imperfect and fallible can be."[47] He put this pointedly in these words:

So far, therefore, as a theological system contains historical elements, it is likely to contain Scriptural elements. So far as its statements of doctrine coincide with those of the creeds and symbols in which the wise, learned, and holy of all ages have embodied the results of their continuous and self-correcting study of the Scriptures, so far it may be expected to coincide with the substance of inspiration itself.[48]

---

47. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 92.

48. Ibid. In this regard it should be mentioned that in the heat of controversy with Briggs, Shedd counteracted the above statements with the following lines published in the New York Observer, January 21, 1891:

"Dr. Briggs speaks of these three fountains of divine authority [the Bible, the Church, and the Reason] as complementary to each other. Now that which is complementary, say all the dictionaries, supplies a deficiency. When, therefore, two or more things are complementary to each other, neither of them is sufficient of itself alone. They are mutually dependent upon each other. Each needs the other, or others, to fill out something wanting in itself. Therefore, if the Bible has the Church and the Reason as its complements, it must be because it is of itself inadequate in some particulars to meet all the religious necessities of mankind. It must be helped out by them. So the author teaches." Briggs, The Bible, The Church, and The Reason (New York, 1892), p. 212.

When Shedd goes on, as the quotation infers that he will, to condemn the teaching he has described, this reveals him to be, temporarily, at least, in conflict with his own teaching as it has been herein described.

Shedd did not presume to imply that this was a human accomplishment. In his Lectures on the Philosophy of History he set forth, at an early age, his continuing insistence that anything of value in the history of the Church was to be attributed to the working of the Divine Power within that history.[49] He reiterated this in the "Preface" to his translation of Guericke's Church History.[50] He re-enforced it in this way in his later volume, Theological Essays:

> The foundation of Christian History is Divine Revelation: the inmost life-power which restores the true development of humanity and the inmost law which regulates the process are the influences of the Divine Spirit allied with the doctrines of the Divine Word . . . . Take away from Christianity the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and the very life of the system disappears. Take away from Church History the actual dispensation of spiritual influences, and the vitality of the process departs. And it is because the Holy Spirit has never left the Church as a whole, while He has suspended His quickening influences in sections, that we can say with the strictest truth, that the progress of the great whole has been continuous, though sometimes interrupted in the parts.[51]

From all of this it becomes clear that there is a natural connection between Church history and dogmatic theology. Furthermore, from this it becomes clear why dogmatic theology is not simply biblical theology. Rather, in a very real sense,

---

49. Shedd, Lectures on the Philosophy of History (Boston, 1861), pp. 79-82.

50. Guericke, H. E. F., A Manual of Church History (Andover, 1857), pp. v-vi.

51. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 175, 185.

[illegible] did not presume to imply that this was a [illegible] ac-

complishment. [illegible]

[illegible], at an early age, [illegible] distinctions that

[illegible] in the history of the Church was to be at-

tributed to the working of the Divine Power within [illegible]

tory,"[illegible] in the "Preface" to his transla-

tion of [illegible]'s [illegible].[30] He re-enforces it in

[illegible] volume, [illegible]:

> The foundation of Christian history is [illegible] revelations [illegible] the [illegible] development of [illegible] which requires [illegible] process [illegible] the influence of the Divine Spirit after the doctrine of the Living Word . . . . [illegible] from [illegible] the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the very [illegible] of the [illegible]. [illegible] the [illegible] of spiritual influences, and the [illegible] departs. And it is [illegible] the [illegible] never left the [illegible] as a whole, [illegible] his quick-ening influence in [illegible], [illegible] the progress of the [illegible] has been con-tinued, though sometimes interrupted [illegible].[31]

From all of this it becomes clear that [illegible] is a natural connection between [illegible] history and [illegible]. Fur-thermore, from this it becomes clear why [illegible], is not [illegible]. [illegible], in a very real sense,

---

[illegible]

[30]. [illegible]

[31]. [illegible]

Church history, conceived of as Shedd did (as a record of a mental inquiry into the nature of Christianity and the contents of the Bible), is the area wherein will be found that doctrinal system which the theological mind has formed by the scientific study of the written revelation. Thus, for Shedd, the substance out of which dogmatic theology is refined is the history of the Church.[52]

That there was but a single system of truth in the written revelation and a single system of truth revealed in a careful study of the history of the Church, was a continuing theme in Shedd's writings. It was a matter of deep conviction with him that Scripture and Church history testified to but a single system of truth. This, in no small way, accounts for the vigor with which he explained and defended the system which he espoused. Two quotations will serve to highlight this important conviction, and to illustrate the manner in which this conviction undergirded Shedd's own theological efforts. He wrote:

The Scriptures teach but one system of truth, . . . and, if the clergyman feels the need of aids in getting at it, imbedded as it is in the living and therefore flexible substance of the Bible, let him study the creeds of the Christian Church . . . . The symbols of the Christian Church do very clearly, and fully, display the opinions of the wisest and holiest men, and the closest students of the Scriptures for sixteen hundred years, in respect to the actual contents of

---

52. Shedd, <u>Theological Essays</u>, pp. 204-206.

Revelation. The clergyman who adopts the theology embodied in them may possibly be in an error; but, if he is, he is in good company, and in a large company.[53]

Within this good and large company, Shedd sought to stand. He believed it to be the place for all conservative theologians. Concerning this, he said:

Conservatism, properly defined, is the disposition to be historical, to attach one's self to those opinions which have stood the test of time, and experience, rather than to throw them away, and invent or adopt new ones. A conservative theologian, for example, is inclined to that system of doctrine which has been slowly forming from age to age, ever since the Christian Mind began a scientific construction of revealed truth, and is unwilling to make any radical changes in it. He concedes the possibility of a further expansion of existing materials, but is opposed to the addition of new, as well as subtraction of old, matter. He does not believe that there are any new dogmas, lying concealed in the Scriptures, having utterly escaped the notice of the theologians of the past . . . . Christianity, for him, is a complete religion. The number of fundamental truths necessary to human salvation is full. The Church of the past needed the same truths, in order to its sanctification and perfection that the Church of the present needs; and it possessed each and every one of them. There can be no essential addition, therefore, to the body of Christian doctrine, until another and new revelation is bestowed from God.[54]

From all of this which has been related concerning Shedd's understanding of reason, the Bible, and Church history, it becomes clear as to what Shedd believed to be the method of arriving at authoritative truth. For him, the fountain of

---

53. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 378-379.

54. Ibid., pp. 383-384.

certainty was the infallible Bible interpreted by the historic philosophical mind of the Christian Church. It was on the basis of this certainty and authority that he taught and wrote. It was the system arrived at in this manner that he expounded and defended.

Chapter III

THE INTERPRETATION OF GOD

1. The Divine Existence

The written revelation, according to Shedd, presents no argument for the existence of God. Rather, it relies upon the immediate and universal consciousness which the human soul has of God. Further, it assumes that this consciousness of God is awakened and developed within the soul by the works of creation and providence.[1] Having recognized that the written revelation contains no argument for the existence of God, Shedd goes on to give the reason for it:

> The reason why the Scriptures make no provision against speculative atheism by syllogistic reasoning is that syllogistic reasoning starts from a premise that is more obvious

---

1. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 198.

and certain than the conclusion drawn from it, and they do not concede that any premise necessary to be laid down in order to draw the conclusion that there is a Supreme Being, is more intuitively certain than the conclusion itself.[2]

Having introduced the idea of intuitive certainty, he proceeds to speak thereafter concerning the idea of God as natural to the human mind. Although this idea of God is rational in its source, the fact that man in his fallen state has it does not indicate virtue in man. Rather, this idea of God must be recognized to be God's gift to man in, and through, God's gift of reason to man. It is by means of this gift of reason that man is immediately and intuitively aware of God.[3]

However, the development of this idea of God is greatly assisted by the syllogistic arguments constructed for evidence of the Divine existence. This is true because these arguments contain a scientific analysis of the natural consciousness of God.[4] Furthermore, these arguments serve to give strength to a man's certainty of the Divine existence in that they furnish him with replies to the arguments of materialism and atheism.[5] Of these arguments, Shedd recognized the ontological, the cosmological, the teleological, the moral, and

---

2. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 196.

3. Ibid., I, 209. 4. Ibid., I, 220.

5. Ibid., I, 222.

the historical.[6] Throughout his writings it is evident that it is the ontological argument that Shedd believed to be of most value. He believed it to be predominantly the argument of the Western tradition in the Church.[7] He believed it to be, by its very nature, the argument with particular pertinence to the minds of men engulfed in their pre-occupation with sense data.[8] And, he believed it to be the superior argument because it, like the God whose existence it proved, was the most independent of all arguments. He made his point in this way:

> The ontological argument is the most rigorously conclusive and mathematical of any because it requires only the idea of God to construct it. The "a posteriori" arguments require both the idea of God and of the created universe. In this respect the ontological argument corresponds better with the absolute independence of God. God's existence does not depend upon that of the universe. He exists before it, and without it. Similarly, the ontological proof of God's existence does not depend upon the existence of a universe by which to prove it.[9]

---

6. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 222-248, in which he gives one paragraph each to the moral argument and the historical argument; two pages each to the cosmological argument and the teleological argument, and twenty pages to the ontological argument.

7. Shedd, History of Doctrine, I, 230-231.

8. Shedd, "The Ontological Argument for Divine Existence," The Presbyterian Review, V (April 1884), 213.

9. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 121.

From this it should be clear that Shedd's thinking concerning God begins with the definition of an idea. That definition is the one which was used by Anselm and which defined God as "the most perfect being." And, this definition with which Shedd begins will be seen to make a very real difference in his appreciation of the nature of the God whose attributes, decrees, and works he expounds. With the idea of God as "the most perfect Being," Shedd couples the idea of God as "eminently a Being of Reason."[10] This means that it is a perfect, reasonable Being, whose nature Shedd describes.

2. God as Personal Spirit and Trinal Being

Shedd regarded the words of Jesus to the Samaritan woman, "God is Spirit,"[11] to be a scientific definition of the nature of God. He found in the definition the idea that "God is Spirit itself, absolutely,"[12] and "God is an essence or substance."[13] This definition, he believed, was of great value to the Christian because it stood in contradiction to that current form of pantheism which defined God as "absolute idea;" that form of thinking which made God to be simply "a

---

10. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 211-212.
11. Gospel According to John 4:24a.
12. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 151.
13. Ibid., I, 158.

power that makes for righteousness"; and that hyper-spirituality which considered God to be but an influence or an energy pervading the world.[14] Thus, for Shedd, a genuine appreciation of the words of Jesus to the Samaritan woman provided that which he believed would fortify the Christian against those very errors concerning the nature of God which were, in the nineteenth century, at odds with the Christian doctrine of God.

Concerning God as substance, Shedd felt it important to recognize that God alone is self-subsistent substance, that is, having His existence in Himself, completely independent of all else, and in no way passively correlated to anything external to Himself. Not only is He self-subsistent, but all the activity and movement of God is internal and self-determined.[15]

Substance, however, is not the only fundamental predicate of Spirit. The other is personality. God is a personal being.[16] As a personal being, God is self-conscious. It is characteristic of personality that it is self-conscious. This highest and most perfect form of consciousness is characteristic of the Supreme Being.[17] And, since the Divine

---

14. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 161.

15. Ibid., I, 171. 16. Ibid., I, 178.

17. Ibid., I, 181.

ians, and would be [illegible] consciousness, and were logic-con-

ally with consciousness [illegible] to [illegible] in influence [illegible]

erating the world.[14] Thus, for Brahm, a personal [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] to the [illegible] would [illegible]

that which he believed would [illegible] the [illegible]

ugh very [illegible] the nature of [illegible] in

dissimilar [illegible], at odds with the Christian doctrine

[illegible].

Recurring God as substance, [illegible] felt it important to

recognize that the [illegible] is a self-existent substance, that

is, being his existence in himself, completely independent

of all else, and [illegible] in any [illegible] connected to anything

[illegible] himself. Not only is he self-existent, but [illegible]

[illegible] of him is [illegible] for self-

[illegible].[15]

[illegible], however, is not [illegible] only [illegible]

[illegible]. The other is [illegible]. [illegible] is a [illegible]

[illegible].[16] As a personal being, [illegible] self-conscious. [illegible] is

[illegible] of personality that [illegible] self-consciousness.

The highest and most perfect form of consciousness is [illegible]

[illegible] of the supreme being.[17] [illegible], since the Divine

---

14. [illegible], [illegible] Theism, [illegible], 161.

15. Ibid., [illegible], 171. 16. Ibid., [illegible], 176.

17. Ibid., [illegible], 281.

self-consciousness is independent of all else, it can be understood only through the mystery of the Trinity. Because personality and self-consciousness depend upon relationships, God can be a self-conscious personality only because He is three Persons.

Shedd's reasoning on this subject was, as he said, a development upon the Trinitarian speculation of Augustine. He first enlarged upon his own development of this idea when he wrote the "Introductory Essay," for a new English edition of Augustine on the Holy Trinity. Later, he gave extensive attention to this argument in his Dogmatic Theology. In part, his reasoning was as follows:

> Self-consciousness is trinal--it involves three distinctions. The whole mind, as a subject, contemplates the very same whole mind as an object. And the very same whole mind also perceives that the contemplating subject and the contemplated object are one and the same essence or being. Here are three distinct modes of one mind--all three going to make up the one self-conscious spirit.[18]

> God, the eternal Father, beholds himself in the eternal Son, his other Self . . . . And the perception that the subject-ego and object-ego, arrived at in the first beholding, are one and the same essence, is the perception of the Holy Spirit who recognizes both the unity and identity of the nature of the Father and the Son, as well as their distinctness of person. Thus the circle of Divine self-consciousness is now complete. By the two acts of perception, and the three resulting distinctions, the eternal Being has made himself his own object and has perceived that He has done so.[19]

---

18. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 183-184.

19. Ibid., I, 188.

Self-consciousness is independent of all else, it can be [illegible] through the agency of the Infinite. [illegible] personality and self-consciousness [illegible] find [illegible], God can be a self-conscious personality only [illegible] three persons.

[illegible] teaching on this subject was, as in [illegible], a development upon the principle of [illegible]. [illegible] first enlarged upon his own development of this [illegible] he wrote the "Introductory Essay," for a new English edition of [illegible] on the [illegible]. [illegible], in [illegible] extensive [illegible] in this argument of his [illegible]. [illegible] this reasoning was as follows:

> Self-consciousness is triune—it involves three distinctions. The whole mind, as a subject, contemplates the very same whole mind as an object. And the very same whole mind [illegible] the contemplating subject and the contemplated [illegible] one and the same essence or being. These three [illegible] of the mind—are three going to make up the one self-conscious spirit.[12]

> [illegible], the eternal Father, beholds himself in the eternal Son, [illegible] image self . . . . And the perception that the subject-ego and object-ego, arrived at in the first beholding, are one and the same essence, is the perception [illegible] the unity and identity of the essence of the Father and the Son, as well as [illegible] distinctness of [illegible]. That the circle of divine self-consciousness is now complete. By the two acts of perception, and the three [illegible] distinctions, the eternal [illegible] has made himself [illegible] object and has perceived that he and the [illegible] are [illegible].

---

12. [illegible]

13. Ibid., [illegible]

Thus, reasoned Shedd, the Divine Nature has all the requisites to personality in its own trinal constitution.[20] In thus establishing this inner necessity for the triune nature of God on what he believed to be the true teachings of psychology, Shedd believed that he had for Christians a sure defense of the doctrine of the Trinity against the Deist and the Unitarian. "If a true psychology does not require trinality in a spiritual essence, in order to its own self-contemplation, self-knowledge, and self-communion, then the deist is correct; but, if it does, then he is in error."[21]

In making such an investigation into the nature of the Trinity, Shedd believed that he was carrying on in the tradition of Coleridge who believed it to be altogether worthy of the Christian thinker to attempt to establish the rationality of the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as its intrinsic necessity.[22]

Shedd, however, went even further and demonstrated the necessity of the Trinity from the fact of God's eternal blessedness. Blessedness, he insisted, is dependent upon society. Blessedness includes such things as joy of love given and returned. This implies more than a single person.

---

20. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 186.

21. Ibid., I, 251-252.

22. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," Works of Coleridge, I, 41.

God, therefore, because He is eternal and independent as well as blessed, must contain within Himself such society as is necessary for blessedness.[23] This God who has within Himself such society as is necessary for blessedness is just the God revealed in the written revelation as Father, Son, and Spirit, eternally. This personalization of God, this societalization of God, is an eternal operation within God Himself. In the language of the early creeds, this eternal operation is the two-fold operation of generation and spiration; or, filiation and procession. God, the Father, is eternally generating, or filiating, the Son. From the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is eternally proceeding or spirating. In this manner is the Eternal Essence personalized. In the eternally personalized Essence of God, therefore, are all the elements of perfect blessedness.[24]

This, of course, does not exhaust the arguments for the truth and reality of the Trinity, but it does make clear that the idea arises out of the inner necessity of the Divine Being. Yet, Shedd recognized that in the history of the Christian Church, the idea of the Trinity arose following the conviction of the early Christians concerning the Deity of

---

23. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 254-255.

24. Ibid., I, 272-293.

Jesus Christ.[25] Furthermore, he recognized that from then until now the most conclusive argument for the truth and reality of the Trinity is that which proceeds from the characteristics of Christian experience.[26] Neither of these arguments for the truth and reality of the Trinity, however, was given much stress in the writings of Shedd.

Shedd did not fail, in emphasizing the trinitarian personality of God, to give emphasis to the unity of God and so to protect himself against the charge of tri-theism. The unity of God inheres fundamentally in the very idea of substance. In defining God as Spirit, Shedd had insisted that Spirit is both substance and personality. And, although the trinity of God inheres in the personality of God, and the unity of God inheres in the substance of God, this is not a logical contradiction because it is affirming that God is one in another sense than that He is three; and that He is three in another sense than that He is one.[27] This, of course, in no way removes the mystery. Shedd put this fact unequivocally, saying: "That a substance without any division or distribution can at the same instant constitute three distinct persons, baffles the human understanding."[28] This mystery of

---

25. Shedd, History of Doctrine, I, 262.

26. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 256.

27. Ibid., I, 268. 28. Ibid., I, 297.

the simultaneous existence of the undivided and total nature of God in each of the three Persons in the God-head, the Nicene Trinitarians sought to illustrate by the use of the figure of "circumincession."[29] Shedd said that this illustration was helpful when understood to mean a continual "in-being" and "in-dwelling" of one person in another. But, how all of this can be, he did not profess to know. Here, he said, is part of the incomprehensibility of the nature of God. Nevertheless, that all of this must be is certain because of the manner in which the Scripture speaks of indwelling, and because of the manner in which the names and functions of the Trinitarian Persons are interchanged in Scripture. Of one thing Shedd was most certain: the doctrine of the Trinity is the surest possible support for belief in the personality and self-consciousness of God.[30]

The idea of God's eternal blessedness which, as has been said, furnished Shedd data for the doctrine of the Trinity, also furnished him data concerning the feelings or emotions of God. He was critical of those who insisted that God is destitute of feeling. That, he said, denuded God of qualities which are necessary to personality. However, Shedd insisted that many of the feelings attributed to God in Holy Scripture

---

29. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 299.

30. Ibid., I, 271.

were, in themselves, at odds with the idea of blessedness. Therefore, such feelings attributed to God in conflict with the idea of blessedness, must be considered metaphorically, and not literally.[31]

There are only two emotions which are real and essential in God. With regularity and consistency, Shedd defines these as "complacency towards righteousness," and "displacency towards sin."[32] The manner in which he arrives at this definition is worthy of note:

> God can not be the subject of any emotion that is intrinsically and necessarily an unhappy one . . . . Tried by this test, it will be found that there are only two fundamental forms of feeling that are literally attributable to the Divine Essence. These are love and wrath . . . . The one awakened by righteousness, and the other by sin . . . . These emotions of love and wrath are compatible with the Divine blessedness. To love righteousness is confessedly blessedness itself . . . . to be displeased with and hate wickedness . . . is a righteous feeling spent upon a wicked thing. When God hates what is hateful, and is angry at that which merits wrath, the true

---

31. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 173-174, which contains, in addition to the above: "The Scriptures attribute feelings to God, and nearly all forms of feeling common to man. That all of these are not intended to be understood as belonging to the Divine nature is plain, because some of them are incompatible with the idea of an infinite and perfect being as are the material instruments of hands and feet attributed to him in Scripture. Such an emotion as fear, for example, which God is represented as experiencing, must be regarded as metaphorical. The same is true of jealousy and grieving."

32. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 173-174.

nature and fitness of things is observed, and he feels in himself that inward satisfaction which is the substance of happiness.[33]

It should be kept in mind that by "love" in this context Shedd means simply "complacency towards righteousness." It should also be kept in mind that even though this "love" and "wrath" are recognized to be attributes of God,[34] they are believed to be so necessarily linked with the very nature of God that Shedd must include them within the discussion of the nature of God. For Shedd, "complacency toward righteousness" and "displacency toward sin" are to be regarded as "natural, organic, necessary, and eternal" feelings of the Godhead![35]

3. The Attributes of Deity

The difficulty which has been evident on the preceding pages concerning these two essential feelings in God as related to the nature of God, and/or, to the attributes of God, is a difficulty which Shedd recognized as inhering in the

---

33. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 174-178. Compare: "The feeling of ethical displeasure exists in the being of God . . . . as a judicial sentiment which is legitimate, and nothing that is legitimate can be intrinsically miserable . . . . Thus, the Deity is blessed in his displacency at that which is vile and hateful." Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 279-281.

34. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 174-175.

35. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 271.

very subject matter itself. "It is impossible for the human mind to know the Deity abstractly from His attributes. The Divine Nature is in and with the attributes, and hence the attributes are as deep and absolute as the nature."[36]

Shedd divided the attributes of God into two groups: (1) the incommunicable attributes, and (2) the communicable attributes. The incommunicable attributes are those which "belong to God exclusively."[37] There is nothing resembling these attributes in any being in the created world. For this reason, these attributes of God are, for the most part, incomprehensible.[38] These incommunicable, incomprehensible, metaphysical attributes of God are simplicity, infinity, immensity, eternity, omnipotence, omniscience, and immutability. Each of these is discussed in detail by Shedd. Partly from the very incomprehensibility of the material presented, and partly from the manner in which it is presented, the impression is given that this portion of Shedd's theology is a correlation of abstract ideas constructed out of definitions arrived at through philosophic speculation. Furthermore, it is evident that Shedd delighted in this kind of speculation. One example of his manner of treating these incommunicable

---

36. Shedd, _History of Christian Doctrine_, I, 242. See also: Shedd, _Dogmatic Theology_, I, 334-335.

37. Shedd, _Dogmatic Theology_, I, 336.

38. _Ibid._, I, 346.

attributes of God must suffice. Concerning the immutability of God, he said:

> The Immutability of God is the unchangeableness of his essence, attributes, purposes, and consciousness . . . . Immutability belongs to the Divine essence and to the Divine will, thus God can have no new attributes, nor are his decrees alterable . . . . Likewise, immutability characterizes the Divine consciousness. Nothing new is added to it, and nothing old is subtracted from it . . . . God is immutable because: his being is from himself and not from another. He can not change for the better nor for the worse. All causes and reasons for change are wanting, viz,: dependence upon another, error of mind, inconstancy of will and purpose. The act of creation 'ex nihilo' made no change in God . . . . Incarnation made no change in God.[39]

In a manner similar to this, Shedd treated each of these incommunicable attributes of God, emphasizing the infinitude and the perfection of each attribute. Also, in each case, he emphasized that which he had said earlier concerning the fact that the attributes, each and all of them, were natural, organic, necessary, and eternal characteristics of Deity.

In treating the communicable, or ethical, attributes of God, Shedd discussed them under four headings: (1) Wisdom, (2) Holiness, (3) Goodness, and (4) Truth. Concerning the wisdom of God and the truth of God, however, he had very little to say. He defined the Divine wisdom as "the intelligence of God as manifested in the adaptation of means to ends."[40] In his early days at the University of Vermont he

---

39. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 354-356.

40. Ibid., I, 356.

had suggested that this adaptive intelligence of the Supreme Being is of little religious value unless connected with the Personality revealed in the written revelation. However, when he interpreted the written revelation in this particular matter of wisdom as an attribute of God, he made very little of that unique wisdom displayed in the cross of Christ. He gave no indication as to just what was the peculiar nature of that wisdom in which Paul gloried, or where its uniqueness lay. Likewise, when he spoke of the Divine wisdom in providence, he did nothing to differentiate the wisdom of the providence of the God of written revelation from the wisdom of the God of natural religion. In fact, there is a sense in which it can be said that, for Shedd, wisdom is to be regarded as a necessary quality in the perfect Being, and, since it will be perfect wisdom, nothing concerning the particular nature of that wisdom needs to be said. For him, it was enough to know and to declare that God is perfectly wise!

There is an equally brief treatment of the attribute of the truth of God. This attribute of the Divine veracity was defined by Shedd as "that attribute of his nature, by virtue of which he performs what he has said."[41] It is clear here also that Shedd regards this as an extension into the ethical realm of the immutability of God which he had already thoroughly discussed. And, once again, the written revelation

---

41. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 391.

made little or no difference in the manner in which this attribute was discussed. In the Bible, what Shedd defined as the Divine veracity is called "the faithfulness of God."[42] Before this aspect of God's behaviour, men stood in amazement and adoration and responded to it in trust. Shedd, however, relegated this to a very brief paragraph at the very close of his discussion of the Divine attributes.

In Shedd's writings there is ample treatment of the attributes of holiness and goodness. Within his treatment of these two attributes will be found that which is fundamental to his system of theology. Therefore, what Shedd had to say concerning these attributes must be closely examined.

Shedd defined the holiness of God to be "the perfect rectitude of his will."[43] This is indeed a tautology because he defined the "right" as that which God wills.[44] However, this definition will be seen to serve Shedd's purpose well as he insists that the strict interpretation of retributive justice is necessarily inherent in the holiness of God, and as he, in effect, equates holiness with justice.

Holiness is, for Shedd, a completely moral attribute which expresses the two essential feelings of God: complacency

---

42. Psalm 40:10; Hebrews 11:11, etc.

43. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 362

44. Shedd, "Bushnell on the Atonement," American Theological Review, IV (January 1867), 168.

toward righteousness and displacency toward evil.[45] Although holiness has to do with the will of God, it is, in its expression, according to Shedd, a most involuntary and necessary attribute of God. Again and again throughout his writing, Shedd insisted: "God must be just."[46] By that he meant to underline his earlier declaration that God must express complacency toward righteousness and displacency toward evil.

There is a definiteness about that which constitutes righteousness and evil. This definiteness is made clear in the moral law, written in the heart of man at his creation.[47] In the moral law, God displays, as it were, the basis upon which his holiness reacts. And, as written in the heart of man at creation, "the Moral Law is the most important and the greatest of the expressions of the Divine Holiness."[48]

As long as man obeyed this moral law, just so long was man righteous, and just so long did he live within the warmth of the Divine complacency toward righteousness. However,

---

45. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 174-175.

46. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 285. Here it is made plain that the exercise of justice can be demonstrated on "a priori" grounds.

47. Although this moral law is comprehended in the Ten Commandments, it is not to be confused with the events at Mt. Sinai, for that expression of the moral law was made necessary by man's sin.

48. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 356.

once man disobeyed, and thus confronted the Divine holiness with sin and evil, the most certain thing about the holiness of God is that it must mete out punishment as the result of this disobedience. Granting the disobedience of man, there is nothing so certain as Divine displacency against sin and evil and the certainty that such Divine displacency will work itself out into punishment.[49] Therefore, that attribute of God which is most certain, given man's disobedience, is the attribute of holiness, expressing itself in retributive justice. Retributive justice, as that part of justice which relates to infliction of penalty, is necessary and certain, once the law of God has been transgressed. Furthermore, in respect to retributive justice, the Sovereignty of God does not extend to either its abolition, or its relaxation. Retributive justice is the most certain of all Divine attributes, and no one of the attributes of God is supported by more, or stronger, evidence than that of retributive justice.[50]

Shedd's emphasis upon retributive justice seems to stem from the fact that he believed that the exercise of justice

---

49. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 285, in which Shedd quotes, to substantiate his position, a long argument from Owen, Dissertation on Divine Justice, Chapter II. See also: "By His holiness God hates sin, and by His justice He punishes it. The one makes Him to hate it, the other makes Him to punish it." Calamy, Edmund, The Works of the Rev. John Howe (New York, 1838), II, 1121.

50. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 370-380.

[illegible], [illegible]

[illegible] will, [illegible]

[illegible] is that it must [illegible] as the [illegible]

[illegible]ence. Granting the disobedience of man, [illegible]

[illegible] certain as divine displeasure against [illegible]

[illegible] the certainty that such divine displeasure will [illegible]

[illegible] punishment." Therefore, that strictness of [illegible]

[illegible] certain, given man's disobedience, is [illegible]

[illegible], expressing itself in [illegible]

[illegible] justice, as that part of justice which [illegible]

[illegible] infliction of penalty, is necessary and certain,

[illegible].

[illegible] retributive justice, the sovereignty of God [illegible]

[illegible] either its infliction, or its remission. Re-

[illegible] justice is the most certain of all [illegible]

[illegible], and of the structure [illegible] is supported by

[illegible], evidence that that of retributive justice. [illegible]

[illegible] upon retributive justice [illegible]

[illegible] that he believed [illegible]

---

17. [illegible], Theological [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]

18. [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]

could be demonstrated on "a priori" grounds.[51] Any attribute of God which could thus be demonstrated would be given priority in Shedd's scheme of things. Necessary truth was the type of truth which impressed Shedd. At one point he had gone so far as to say, "Nothing that is not metaphysically necessary is scientific."[52] Because justice fit so clearly into this category, Shedd regarded it as the ultimate and central attribute of God.[53]

He had held this view for a long time. Even while he was professor of English in the University of Vermont he had written:

> Justice . . . . is the fundamental of all fundamentals, whether the being of the Creator, or of creation is contemplated. Justice is the deepest of all the deep teachings of God, underlying the whole God-head, and forming the equilibrium of the Divine character.[54]

This insistence brought Shedd into conflict not only with most of the more liberal theological thinkers of the time, but also with some of the able defenders of the conservative theological position. Edwards A. Park, Abbot Professor of Systematic Theology at Andover Theological Seminary,

---

51. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 285.

52. Shedd, History of Doctrine, II, 275.

53. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 284-285.

54. Shedd, "College Education," Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review, VII (Andover, 1850), 140.

had preached a sermon under the general title, "All the Moral Attributes of God are Comprehended in His Love."[55] Park says of this, and of the other sermons in his book, that it represents the type of emphasis that he had made throughout the period during which he and Shedd were fellow faculty members at Andover.

Shedd quite obviously referred to this kind of emphasis when, in his article on the Atonement, written in 1859, he said:

> The inspired assertion that "God is a consuming fire" (Heb. xi. 29) is just as categorical and unqualified as the inspired assertion that "God is love" (I John iv. 8) or the inspired assertion that "God is light" (I John i. 5). Hence it is as inaccurate to resolve all the Divine emotions into love, as it would be to resolve them all into wrath. The truth is, that it is the Divine Essence alone, and not any one particular attribute, that can be logically regarded as the unity in which all the characteristic qualities of the Deity center and inhere.[56]

Again, in his Dogmatic Theology, he spoke against those who would "reduce the moral attributes to one, namely the Divine love," and repeated his insistence that the "Divine attributes do not find a center of unity in any one of their own number, but in the Divine Essence."[57]

---

55. Parks, E. A., Discourses (Andover, 1885), Sermon VII, pp. 155-180.

56. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 273.

57. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 435.

Nevertheless, having said this, Shedd proceeded to speak of the "capital position of Divine Justice." Here is a paragraph which reveals his thinking in this regard:

It has been a query among those who have speculated upon the nature of the Deity: What is the base or substrate of His Being? . . . with reference to God's moral constitution, with reference to that congeries of ethical attributes which belongs to him as a personal being, it is as certain as anything can be, that the deep substrate and base of them all, is eternal law and impartial justice. This pervades all the rest, keeps them in equilibrium, and constitutes, as it were, the very divinity of the Deity. And this view of the primary nature of justice coincides with the convictions of men in all ages. In all time, justice has been the one particular divine attribute that has pressed most heavily upon the human race. . . . Nor let it be objected that this is owing to the fact that man is sinful, and that this quality in the Supreme Being would not be so prominent in the mind of an unfallen creature who has nothing to fear from it. The utterance of the pure burning seraphim is: Holy, Holy, Holy . . . . That which comes first into the minds of the spotless and unfearing worshippers in God's immediate presence . . . is that particular characteristic in the Divine Being, by virtue of which he has a right to sit on the eternal throne; that specific attribute upon which the moral administration of the universe must be established.[58]

When this article was republished almost twenty years later, Shedd took occasion to point out that he had not changed his position and to point especially to his views upon the necessary exercise of justice by God.[59] How true this was can be deduced from these facts gained from a study of the Index references in Shedd's monumental work, Dogmatic Theology.

---

58. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 290-291.

59. Ibid., Preface.

Agape, the distinctly God-like love, is not listed. Benevolence of God is referred to six times. Love of Christ is not referred to. Love of God is not referred to. The loving-kindness of God is not referred to. Grace is referred to seven times. Love, meaning complacency and compassion, is referred to once. Mercy is referred to six times. Thus, there are a total of twenty references which could be construed as pointing to the love of God. Justice of God is referred to nine times. The wrath of God is referred to twelve times. Together, these two outnumber all the references to God's love, or any equivalents thereof.[60] Thus it is clear that any statements to the contrary notwithstanding, Shedd believed that justice, and especially retributive justice, was fundamental to the very nature of God, and that all of the other ethical attributes must be conditioned by its requirements.

There is little or nothing of "necessity" in the Divine goodness as that attribute is expounded by Shedd. He conceived of Divine wisdom, truth and holiness as "necessary," both in their inclusion as Divine attributes, and in their exercise by Deity. But, it is not so with the attribute of Divine goodness. Shedd admitted that it is necessary that God be good. What this meant for him is set forth in a

---

60. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, Index, and III, Index.

sermon entitled: "The Supreme Excellence of God." The text is Matthew 19:16-17, with the emphasis upon Jesus' words: "There is none good but God." Within this sermon there are these points:

> Let us therefore look at the pre-eminence of God over all creatures. 1. God is the only necessarily good being. There is a necessity that has its foundation in the nature and idea of a thing. In this manner God is necessarily good. 2. God is the only originally Good Being. God _is_ Good, not merely _has_ goodness. Good originates in God. 3. So God is the only self-subsistently Good Being. He is good independent of all else. 4. God is the only immutably Good Being. From all of this comes the conclusion that God alone is to be glorified and adored.[61]

Thus it must be said that Shedd did not slight the inherent goodness of the nature of God. But, for Shedd, the exercise of this goodness is to be recognized as a purely voluntary matter. In this regard he quoted from Charnocke's work, _The Goodness of God_, to the effect that: "The Goodness of Deity is infinite and circumscribed by no limits; but the exercise of this Goodness may be limited by himself . . . . God is necessarily good in his nature; but free in his communication of it."[62] Charnocke, Owen, Howe, and Shedd, in making this emphasis, made much of Romans 9:15, "But, saith the Lord, I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy." With a sermon

---

61. Shedd, _Sermons to the Spiritual Man_ (New York, 1884), pp. 35-53.

62. Shedd, _Dogmatic Theology_, I, 389.

on this text, entitled, "Exercise of Mercy Optional with God," Shedd made these statements:

> He teaches that He is under no obligation or necessity to show mercy. . . . The exercise of justice is necessary, while that of mercy is optional . . . . God is under the necessity of punishing sin, but is under no necessity of pardoning it. . . . Mankind must take the declaration and promise of God respecting the exercise of mercy, precisely as He has given it. They must follow the record implicitly without any criticisms or alterations.[63]

Here again is the contrast between God's justice and God's goodness. God is not absolutely sovereign and free to dispense His justice in what methods and measures He pleases. But--

> God is absolutely free to dispense his Goodness in what methods and measures he pleaseth, according to the free determinations of his own Will, guided by the wisdom of his own Mind, and regulated by the holiness of his Nature.[64]

And, whereas God can limit the exercise of His goodness, He can not so limit the exercise of His justice. Herein Shedd most clearly differentiated the two attributes of God: God's justice is necessary, God's goodness, in its exercise, is optional.

In his discussion of the goodness of God, Shedd included the Divine benevolence, the Divine mercy, and the Divine

---

63. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, pp. 359-378.

64. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, ch. ix, vs. 15, p. 289.

grace. Naturally, when he discussed these three aspects of Divine goodness, nothing is regarded as "necessary." He is most precise in definition. The Divine benevolence is that "affection which the Creator feels toward the creature, as creature."[65] The Divine mercy is the "benevolent compassion of God towards man as sinner."[66] And, the Divine grace is that aspect of Divine mercy as is directed to sinful man as guilty.[67]

The Divine benevolence, that affection which the Creator feels toward the creature, as such, grows out of the fact that the creature is His workmanship. God is interested in everything which He has made.[68] It is this benevolent affection toward His creatures which enables men to speak of the Fatherhood of God. God is the Father of all men, without exception, in that He is their Creator. As Father, He has a benevolent concern for all men.[69] This benevolence of God is to be regarded as "fatherly" simply because it so far exceeds the merit of the creature. The creature has absolutely

---

65. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 385.

66. Ibid., I, 389. 67. Ibid., I, 390.

68. Ibid., I, 386. Just how this definition and description of Divine benevolence squares with the earlier insistence that "the creation 'ex nihilo' made no change in God" is not easy to comprehend.

69. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, Sermon IV, pp. 50-52. See also: Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 27.

no merit before God. This inheres in the fact that man is a created being, and that man is consistently sustained and upheld by God.[70] For these reasons Shedd holds that a display of benevolence toward man is never to be regarded as "necessary." So, whatever display of benevolence there is, it is evidence of the Creator's good will. It pleases the Father to be good to His creation. And, there is very substantial evidence of the Creator's good will. The objections to the Creator's benevolence are not regarded by Shedd to be of such nature to cause doubt.[71] This world is definitely the object of the benevolent care of its Creator.

Neither the Divine mercy nor the Divine grace could have been made manifest, had not man sinned. In fact, Shedd said: "The reason for the permission of sin was the manifestation of the Divine attributes of mercy and grace, which could not have been manifested otherwise."[72] Thus, the attributes of

---

70. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, pp. 129-138.

71. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 388-389. Shedd's answers to the common objections to the doctrine of Divine benevolence are: The permission of sin cost God more than it did man. The suffering of both animals and man is often greatly exaggerated. Most of man's suffering comes from the vices of intemperance and sensuality. The amount of enjoyment, in both animals and man is greater than the amount of suffering. And, the great majority of the human family are redeemed by Christ. Thus, God is benevolent.

72. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 421. See also I, 422: "The position that sin is necessary to the best possible universe is objectionable, unless, by the best possible universe be meant the universe best adapted to manifest the Divine attributes."

[illegible] Redemption. This [illegible] that man is a created being, and that man is considered [illegible] by God.[10] [illegible] that a [illegible] of benevolence toward man is never to be regarded as [illegible] necessity." So, whatever display of benevolence there is, it is evidence of the Creator's good will. [illegible] [illegible] the positive evidence of the Creator's good will. [illegible] and the greatest benevolence are not [illegible] [illegible].[11] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] care of [illegible].

[illegible] the Divine mercy, nor the Divine grace could have [illegible] manifested, had not man sinned. In fact, [illegible] the reason for the permission of sin was [illegible] the Divine attributes of mercy and justice, which could not have been manifested otherwise."[12] Thus, the [illegible]

---

11. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible].

12. Strong, Systematic Theology, [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] the common objection to the doctrine of divine [illegible]: The permission of sin [illegible] [illegible]. The suffering of [illegible] [illegible] greatly exaggerated. Most of [illegible] suffering [illegible] [illegible] of intemperance and [illegible]. [illegible] in both animals and man is greater than [illegible] [illegible], the great majority of the human race [illegible] by Christ. Thus, God is benevolent.

13. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] that sin is necessary to the best possible [illegible] [illegible] is [illegible], unless, or [illegible] [illegible] the universe best adapted to manifest the divine perfections."

mercy and grace are to be understood as related specifically to man as sinner. And, just because sin is an irrational and unpredictable fact in the ordered universe of God's creation, just so, the exercise of mercy and grace are unpredictable, that is, wholly dependent upon the good pleasure of God. This is why Shedd was at one with the Protestant Scholastics Owen, Howe, and Charnocke, in emphasizing Romans 9:15 and insisting that "the mercy of God is optional, it is not predictable."[73]

As Shedd defined Divine mercy, it is the Fatherly compassion of God toward His creatures in the miserable estate to which they were brought by their sin. This Fatherly compassion issues from the benevolent interest previously described as God's feeling toward the work of His hands.[74] Of this, Shedd said: "God has a benevolent and merciful feeling towards the fallen human spirit: a, because it is His own handiwork, and b. because of its capacity for holiness

---

73. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 389 and II, 401. See also: Shedd, Commentary on Romans, ch. 1, vs. 17, p. 18 and ch. 9, vs. 15, pp. 288-289. In addition to Romans 9:15 the most used quotation from Scripture on this subject is: "And the Lord said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy." Exodus 33:19.

74. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 402.

[illegible] to be inherent in Himself essentially,

[illegible]. God, just because sin is an affront [illegible]

[illegible] in the creature, [illegible]

[illegible] the exercise of mercy and grace is [illegible]

[illegible]. That is, wholly dependent upon the good pleasure of

[illegible]. This is why Grace is one with the [illegible]

[illegible], in canonically [illegible]

[illegible] "the mercy of [illegible] is optional, it is not

[illegible]."[73]

[illegible] divine mercy, it is [illegible]

[illegible] of God toward His creatures in their miserable

[illegible] which they have brought by their sin. This [illegible]

[illegible] from the [illegible] interest previously re-

[illegible] as God's feeling toward the work of His hands.[74] A

[illegible], Hodge said: "God has a benevolent and [illegible] feel-

[illegible] towards the fallen human spirit: a, because it is His

[illegible], and b. because of its misery and wretched

---

73. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, [illegible]. See also Hodge, Systematic Theology, [illegible]. In addition to [illegible] the only [illegible] quotation from Scripture on this subject is: "The Lord said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy." Exodus 33:19.

74. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, [illegible].

and worship."[75] This compassion, Shedd refused to call love. In the argument for his particular interpretation of Divine mercy he insisted that this feeling is not ἀγάπη but is χρηστότης. He makes the same comment upon Romans 5:8, "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." In his comments, he spoke of the "Divine compassion" and the "compassionate benevolence," but not of the Divine love.[76] In short, God's compassionate benevolence toward the miserable estate into which man fell because of sin, is aroused because man is still God's handiwork, even though fallen. This compassionate

---

75. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 423-424. See also: Shedd, *Theological Essays*, p. 271, a portion of which reads: "The love of benevolence, or the Divine compassion, issues from the voluntary disposition of God, from his heart and affections. It is good-will . . . . Says Augustine (*Tractatus in Joannem*, 111): 'It is written, God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us (Rom. 5:8). He loved us, therefore, even when, in the exercise of enmity against him, we were working iniquity. And yet it is said with perfect truth: "Thou hatest, O Lord, all workers of iniquity" (Ps. 55:5). Wherefore, in a wonderful and divine manner, *he both hated and loved us at the same time*. He hated us, as being different from what he had made us; but as our iniquity had not entirely destroyed his work in us, he could at the same time, in every one of us, hate what we had *done*, and love what He had *created*.' . . . . Calvin, after quoting the above from Augustine, remarks (*Inst*. II, xvi, 3) 'God, who is the perfection of righteousness, can not love iniquity, which he beholds in us all . . . . But, because the Lord will not lose in us that which is his own, he yet discovers something that his goodness may love. For, notwithstanding we are sinners through our own fault, yet we are still his *creatures*.'"

76. Shedd, *Commentary on Romans*, pp. 116-117. See also: Romans 11:22, pp. 342-343.

benevolence, this Divine mercy, proves itself, according to Shedd, in providing atonement for the sin which cast man into such an estate, and which atonement would make possible the rescue of man from that miserable estate, and, at the same time, make possible the restoration to God of that which He had created.[77] Thus, a real understanding and appreciation of the Divine mercy can not be acquired save in the light of that mighty atoning act whereby God provided for the satisfaction of his own wrath and justice. This atoning act of God will be discussed in another chapter.

There is another aspect of the Divine mercy to which Shedd rarely referred. It is the Divine forbearance and long-suffering. This is emphasized in the Bible, and in the Westminster Confession. But it is mentioned by Shedd only in the Commentary on Romans where he was obliged to comment upon an explicit statement by the Apostle Paul.[78] Here he spoke of the Divine self-restraint whereby the Divine compassion holds back the fierceness and wrath of the holy God with regard to the immediate punishment of sinful men. He remarked concerning the "stranger forbearance to punish" which is sometimes so marked as to be painful to the

---

77. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 288. See also: Commentary on Romans, ch. 5, vs. 15, p. 135.

78. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, ch. ix, vs. 22, pp. 298-299.

[illegible]

men from that miserable estate [illegible]

[illegible]

There is another aspect of the Divine mercy to which [illegible]

[illegible]. This is emphasized in the Bible, and in the Westminster Confession. But it is mentioned by them only [illegible] the Shorter Catechism where we are obliged to [illegible] statement by the Apostle [illegible] of the Divine self-restraint which [illegible] back the references [illegible] to the immediate punishment of [illegible] the "strange forbearance" [illegible] so marked as to be [illegible]

[illegible]

conscience of man, leading men to cry out: "How long, O Lord, how long?" This, he wrote with reference to particular forbearance in cases of such wicked men as Tiberius and Caesar Borgia, and not with reference to God's forbearance and long-suffering concerning all sinful men.

Divine grace, like Divine mercy, is only to be understood in relation to sinners. Grace denotes that "feeling in God which inclines Him to show favor to the guilty."[79] This grace is of two kinds, sometimes denoted as common and special grace, and at other times a common and regenerating grace. Common grace is the favor which God universally shows to the guilty.[80] This includes all that God does within the life of the sinner for the purpose of overcoming the enmity of the sinner's mind toward eternal truth and toward overcoming the opposition of the sinner's will to the will of God. Were the sinner to respond to this activity on the part of God, the sinner would accept the gift of salvation provided by God. But, though it is difficult, from the very nature of the case, to describe these activities and influences of God which make up common grace, the one thing certain about common grace is that it is universally a failure.

---

79. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, ch. iii, vs. 24, p. 78.

80. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 96.

[illegible] cry out: "How [illegible]

[illegible] with reference to [illegible]

[illegible] men [illegible]

[illegible] not with reference to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the purpose of [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] the sinner to [illegible] this activity [illegible]

[illegible] would [illegible] gift of salvation pro-

[illegible] but, though it is difficult, from the very

[illegible] the case, to describe these activities and [illegible]

[illegible] which make up common grace, the one thing cer-

[illegible] grace is that it is universally [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

In every case, human depravity defeats common grace.[81] However, through it all, God sincerely desires that the sinner's conversion should result from this gracious activity on His part. He sincerely desires this, although He knows full well that His desire will be unfulfilled. It is the very nature of God's common grace, by definition, that it is unsuccessful.[82] In clear and positive manner, Shedd said:

Christ declares that if the common grace granted to Chorazin and Bethsaida, which was ineffectual with them, had been granted to Tyere and Sidon, it would have been effectual with these. . . . According to this statement of our Lord, the very same amount of Divine influence may succeed in overcoming a sinner's opposition in one instance, and not in another. When it succeeds, it is effectual and irresistible grace; when it fails, it is ineffectual and resistible. This shows that grace is to be measured relatively by the result. All grace that fails is common; all that succeeds is special.[83]

The import of this, and where it leads, is made clear in these words:

When Stephen says, "Ye stiff-necked, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost" (Acts 7:51) he is speaking with respect to common grace, and not regenerating grace. Common grace is universal,

---

81. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, pp. 108-109.

82. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 454. See also III, 196-197, where Shedd brings together quotations from Howe and Charnocke to give further substance to the idea that God is sincere in hoping that man will respond affirmatively to common grace. Yet, with all this, Shedd again repeated his insistence that common grace is absolutely certain to fail.

83. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 198.

but is without regenerating power. In order to save a sinner, a higher grade of grace is required, this is that regenerating grace which "powerfully determines the sinner's will." Here is where Divine discrimination comes in.[84]

Thus it becomes clear that just as the discussion of Divine mercy led straight to God's self-satisfying activity in the atonement, so the discussion of Divine grace leads straight to God's sovereign activity in election and reprobation. This will be discussed in that section which follows on the sovereignty of God in predestination.

Although this brings to a close the discussion of the attributes of Divine benevolence, mercy, and grace, there is yet more concerning God which Shedd seemed to appreciate, yet dared not treat as positively as the _Westminster Confession_ suggests it should be. In the _Confession_,[85] as in the Bible,[86] it is clearly stated that "God is the rewarder of them that do diligently seek Him." There is, in the Calvinistic tradition, that which indicates a faith in God's willingness to reward the sincere efforts of men. This can be seen in the emphasis placed upon man's duty to cooperate with common grace. In his discussion of regeneration in _Dogmatic_

---

84. Shedd, "Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of the Divine Decrees," _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, I (New York, 1890), 7-8.

85. _Westminster Confession of Faith_, II, 1.

86. Hebrews 11:6.

Theology, Shedd devoted thirteen pages to the "preparative activity" which a man ought to engage in as cooperation with common grace. He concluded this portion of the discussion as follows:

> While regeneration is a sovereign act of God according to election, it is an encouraging fact both for the sinner and the preacher of the word that God's regenerating grace is commonly bestowed where the preparatory work is performed.[87]

In this manner Shedd conditionally suggested that God is the rewarder of them that do diligently seek Him. Perhaps to have done more would have been to give the impression that regeneration is somehow a debt to the man who has cooperated with common grace. This, however, Shedd would never have even suggested. Nevertheless, he did go so far as to suggest that it is safe for the sinner to pray for the gift of regenerating grace with certainty that his sincere prayer would be answered.[88] In fact, it was concerning prayer that Shedd came the closest to making it definite that God was indeed the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. God has not only promised to hear prayer that is sincere, but this He does continually. And, he does this although He is in no way obligated to hear prayer. Thus does He faithfully

---

87. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 525.

88. Ibid.

reward all those who rely upon His promise to hear sincere prayer and who give real expression to their reliance.[89]

Furthermore, Shedd's preaching, as displayed in Sermons to the Natural Man, revealed his belief that any man can receive the Holy Spirit if he will but pray for it with sincerity. "Now," said Shedd, "it is deserving of special and careful notice that the influence of the Holy Spirit may be obtained by the asking for it. . . . This gift is peculiar in that it is invariably bestowed whenever it is sincerely implored."[90]

The number of times in his sermons when the conclusion is the exhortation "pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit," is evidence that at this point, predominantly, Shedd believed that God is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Here, more than anywhere else, he came close to portraying a God who actually "responded" to man's activity. That he made little of this in his treatment of the Divine benevolence, mercy, and grace, is increased evidence that it was not his inclination to give emphasis to anything which might, in any way, be interpreted as a challenge to the absolute and free sovereignty of God.

---

89. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, pp. 353-356.

90. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, p. 155.

4. The Sovereignty of God

It was suggested earlier that Shedd gave priority to the incommunicable, and therefore, incomprehensible attributes of God. They are made to be definitive and controlling in his presentation of God. Shedd relied upon them heavily in his presentation of his doctrine of absolute Divine sovereignty. Therefore, it is highly possible that it will be an incomprehensible sovereignty that is here presented as the sovereignty of God is considered in: (a) the Divine Decrees, (b) Creation and Providence, (c) Predestination, and (d) Endless Punishment.

a. The Divine Decrees

Concerning the Divine foreordination of everything which comes to pass, Shedd only reproduced the most rigid Calvinist tradition. In this tradition there had developed a definite body of writing which was more or less uniform in its insistence upon the absolute sovereignty of God. Furthermore, the doctrine of foreordination and predetermination is of a piece with the Divine omniscience, the Divine omnipotence, and the Divine immutability. This was recognized by Shedd and he pointed it out to the critics of Chapter III in the _Westminster Confession of Faith_, that chapter dealing with the Divine decree. Shedd suggested to these critics that their criticism was a clear indication that the truth of Chapter II

of the Confession, the chapter dealing with the nature and attributes of God, was either misunderstood or denied.[91] Such phrases as "most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of His own immutable and most righteous will," and "hath most sovereign dominion over them [all creatures], to do by them, for them, or upon them whatsoever himself pleaseth," and "nothing is to Him uncertain or contingent," are not only part of Chapter II of the Confession, but are the very phrases which underlie the doctrine of Divine decree. This fact lies behind the vigor with which Shedd defended the doctrine of Divine decree.[92]

In addition to the above, however, the doctrine of the Divine decree is a way of declaring how the absolutely sovereign God is indeed, God over all. The Divine purpose and government is presented as without limitation.[93] This appealed to Shedd's taste for thorough consistency.

Shedd made of God's foreordaining decree the necessary condition of God's foreknowledge. He reasoned in this manner:

---

91. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 5.

92. Ibid. This work is almost entirely devoted to the defense of Chapter III of the Confession of Faith.

93. Shedd, "Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of the Divine Decree," op. cit., p. 4.

was Descartes, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

In addition to the above, however, the doctrine of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The Divine Decree is the necessary condition of the Divine foreknowledge. If God does not first decide what shall come to pass, He can not know what will come to pass. An event must be made certain before it can be known as a certain event.[94]

If God does not first decide that an event shall happen, he must wait and see whether it happens in order to any certain knowledge; and this would make a change in His knowledge. But, God's knowledge is a fixed quantity because He knows everything from everlasting to everlasting, and at every instant.[95]

Having suggested that the Divine decree is the necessary condition of eternal omniscience ascribed to God, it was necessary then only to describe the nature of the sovereign decree by means of which God made certain whatsoever comes to pass. However, Shedd gives no definitive statement concerning this which is brief enough to be quoted. However, the force of his argument comes to this: The Divine decree is that activity of the Divine mind and will whereby God brings all things into being and governs their activity in such a manner that all events in history are certain for Him, and all things work to the fulfillment of His purpose. The Divine decree is eternal, immutable, and universal and is founded in the Divine wisdom which it expresses.[96]

Concerning the importance of the Divine decree, Shedd wrote:

---

94. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 396-397.

95. Ibid., I, 353.

96. Ibid., I, 395-405.

The most important aspect of the Divine Decree is that it brings all things that come to pass in space and time into a plan. There can be no system of the universe if there be no one Divine purpose that systematizes it.[97]

This Divine decree, which is the Divine purpose systematizing all things, is executed in time and space, in creation and providence, and in redemption and reprobation. Its meaning and nature are to be discovered and appreciated through observation of its execution.

b. Creation and Providence

God creates all things from eternity by one act of power.[98] This is God's first activity outside Himself and is the execution of His own all-comprehending decree. This creative act is the origination of all things out of nothing. In declaring this latter fact, the written revelation is unique among the cosmogonies of the world.[99]

Although in relationship to eternity, the all-creating act of God was a single act, in its execution in time it was accomplished through a series of creative fiats, taking place on succeeding days, even as described in Genesis 1:3-

---

97. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 398.

98. Ibid., I, 345-346.

99. Ibid., I, 464.

31.[100] From this Mosaic record concerning the manner of the execution of God's decree, it is to be learned that God Himself did fix and establish the limits that separate the kingdoms and the several species within the kingdoms from each other.[101] In this way the written revelation contradicts that type of evolution which assumes the transmutation of the species.[102] For Shedd, creation was considered as completed upon the "sixth day"; for, "since the sixth day the Creator has, in this world, exerted no strictly creative energy. He rested from the work of creation upon the seventh day, and still rests."[103] So did Shedd place the written revelation in sharp contradiction to the theory of evolution as it had developed in his time. Then, to further discredit the theory of evolution, he added the following arguments: (1) the

---

100. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 484. See also I, 346, where, in his discussion of the omniscience and immutability of God, Shedd insisted that it was impossible to define God's eternal causation as an endless succession of creative volitions. It must be a single, all-creating act of God's purpose and power.

101. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 485. See also III, 205, where Shedd quotes Sir Charles Bell, a distinguished British naturalist to the effect that "Everything declares the diversity of species to have its origin in distinct creations; and not to be owing to a process of gradual transition from some original type."

102. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 217-220 and I, 501.

103. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, II, 13, a part of the discussion of Traducianism which theory Shedd held and defended.

[illegible]

ll.[101] From this fossil record concerning the nature of the [illegible] [illegible] it is to be learned that the [illegible] [illegible] and established the limits that separate the [illegible] [illegible] and the present species within the [illegible] [illegible].[102] In this way the written revelation [illegible] [illegible] type of evolution which assumes the transmutation of the species.[103] For Gould, creation was considered as con[illegible] [illegible] the "sixth day"; for, "since the [illegible] day the [illegible] [illegible], in this world, exerted no [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] the work of creation upon the seventh day, [illegible] [illegible] rests."[104] So did Gould place the written revelation [illegible] [illegible] to the theory of evolution as it [illegible] [illegible] in his time. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], he added the following arguments: (1) the

---

101. Gould, [illegible], [illegible]. See also I, [illegible]. [illegible], in his discussion of the [illegible] [illegible] of Man, Gould insisted that it was impossible to [illegible] [illegible] original connection [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] operative conditions. It must be [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

102. Gould, [illegible], I, [illegible]. See also [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] "everything [illegible]" the diversity of species to have its origin in [illegible] [illegible]; and not to be owing to a process of [illegible] [illegible] from some original type."

103. Gould, [illegible], III, [illegible] and I, [illegible].

104. Gould, History of [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible] of the discussion of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible].

theory is completely lacking in the highest order of proof, namely, that which can be expressed in mathematical formulae;[104] and (2) there has been no evidence presented of so much as a single instance where one real species has developed into another real species.[105] "Darwin's pigeons are pigeons still."[106]

Though Shedd insisted that all things were, in their species, created by successive creative fiats as described in the Mosaic record, he did not believe that the days mentioned in Scripture were twenty-four hour days. In his review of Dabney's Syllabus in Theology, Shedd said:

> The author . . . objects to the explanation of the six days in Genesis one as periods and favors the view that they are 24 hour days, claiming that to be the most logical and natural interpretation of the scriptural language. This we think is incorrect. The patristic and Medieval exegete, from the simple study of the word, and with no reference to physical days, understood a vast antiquity to be taught in Genesis one. The discoveries of modern physics have only revived in the church the earlier explanation of the Mosaic account which was purely philological and entirely unmodified by physical science.[107]

---

104. Shedd, "Materialistic Physics Unmathematical," The Presbyterian and Reformed Review, II, 323-326.

105. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 86-87.

106. Ibid.

107. Shedd, "Review of Syllabus," Presbyterian Review, I, 390.

This does not mean, however, that Shedd was willing to give to the geologists the right to fix the chronology of mankind's early history. He could not allow this, for it would suggest error in the Biblical chronology. Therefore, he gives six pages in Volume One of his Dogmatic Theology and twelve pages in Volume Three to the presentation of the arguments for the superiority of the Bible chronology concerning the antiquity of man.[108]

Shedd conceived of the created universe in terms of the dualism, matter and mind.[109] According to him, the whole domain of physical nature (matter) was created to be subservient to the mind.[110]

Although he was quite certain and specific concerning the purpose of the creation of matter, he had no specific answer to the question concerning the purpose of creation in general, or man in particular. He gave the traditional answer, "for the glory of God," but he did little to define that glory. Thus he really left the purpose of creation undefined. He spoke of God creating the universe as another

---

108. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 515-521, III, 522-534.

109. Shedd, "What is Animal Life?" A Symposium, Presbyterian and Reformed Review, I, 443-447.

110. Shedd, "Comparative Certainty of Metaphysics and Physics," Presbyterian Review, III, 13.

[illegible] deny, however, [illegible]

[illegible] any possibility the right to [illegible]

[illegible] history. He could not [illegible]

[illegible] in the biblical [illegible]

[illegible] pages in Volume [illegible]

[illegible] pages in Volume Three to [illegible]

[illegible] the superiority of the [illegible]

[illegible] ability of man.[108]

[illegible] of the created [illegible]

[illegible] mind.[109] According to him, [illegible]

[illegible] nature [illegible]

[illegible].[110]

[illegible] to the quite certain and [illegible]

[illegible] question of [illegible]

[illegible] the question concerning the purpose of [illegible]

[illegible], woman in particular. [illegible]

[illegible], "the last thing of God," [illegible]

[illegible]logy. Thus he [illegible]

[illegible]

---

107. [illegible]

108. [illegible] "What is [illegible]" [illegible]

109. [illegible]

substance from Himself, and of God's giving distinctness to that creation so that the created universe has a nature of its own.[111] Yet he gave no real indication that this had a definite purpose or made any definite difference in the way of viewing the world. Nor did he, in any but the most oblique way, link creation with the Logos, the second Person of the Trinity, as did John the Gospel writer and John Calvin.[112] The nearest he came to suggesting why God created the world, and man, is in his discussion of the "Covenant of Works," whereby man was put on probation with the possibility of sinning, but, at the same time, with the possibility of securing for himself immutable perfection, everlasting holiness, and blessedness.[113] Beyond this, Shedd did not go. It can be conjectured that Shedd refrained from saying anything concerning the reason for creation lest he in some way be interpreted as detracting from the Divine self-sufficiency.

The difficulty presented by Shedd's reaffirmation of the strict Calvinist position concerning the origin of sin might have been lessened had he given some indication why God created the universe, and man in the universe. Shedd held that

---

111. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 474, 528.

112. John 1:5, and Calvin, Commentary on the Gospel According to John, ch. 1, vs. 5.

113. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 406-411.

sin and moral evil are something which God decreed and made certain, but, without being the cause thereof.[114] Using the terms of succession, which apply only to the order of time, this can be described by saying that God created the universe and man, then permitted sin and man's fall, and then God decreed concerning fallen man.[115] This, though it can be described, can not be explained. Yet "man's inability to explain how God can make sin certain, but not compulsory, by permissive decree, is no reason for denying that God can do it, or that He has done it."[116]

In this respect, it is well to remember that Shedd divided the Divine decree into efficacious determination and permissive determination.[117] Permissive determination relates to moral evil only. Sin is the sole and solitary object of this species of decree. The permissive determination division of the Divine decree renders the event infallibly certain, but not by immediately acting upon and in the finite will, as in the case of efficacious decree. Thus, the permissive decree is a decree not to hinder the sinful self-determination of the finite will, and to regulate and control

---

114. Shedd, "Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of Decrees," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, I, 4.

115. Ibid., I, 3.   116. Ibid.

117. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 406.

[illegible]

[illegible] [16] [illegible]

[illegible] it is well to remember [illegible] the cosmic laws [illegible] [17] relative movement [illegible] in the field [illegible] specific [illegible]. The particular [illegible] the divine cosmic [illegible] not by immediate [illegible] the finite [illegible] in the case of [illegible]. Thus, the [illegible] of the finite [illegible] negative [illegible]

---

15. [illegible], "[illegible]" [illegible]

16. Ibid., [illegible]

17. [illegible]

the result of the sinful self-determination.[118] But, in the last analysis, how the permissive decree can make the origin of sin a certainty is an inscrutable mystery.[119] It should be noted that this same inscrutable mystery comes into view again when Shedd discussed the matter of "predestination to reprobation," which is another aspect of the eternal decree.

It must be noted, however, that Shedd believed that God's permission of sin is no indication of what God desires. Though God decreed sin, He abhors it.[120] Still, according to Shedd, God created man with the possibility of sinning, for the purpose of putting him on probation, that "by resisting Satan's temptation and persevering in holiness, man might secure immutable perfection."[121] Yet it was certain that such would not be the case! So it happens that Shedd's treatment of the permissive determination of man's infallibly certain sin simply makes meaningless Shedd's contention that permission of sin was made necessary because of the probation, the end of which was perfection. This unresolved confusion remains unresolved.

---

118. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 406.

119. Ibid., I, 411.

120. Shedd, "Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of Decrees," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, I, 14.

121. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 151.

Creation, as discussed by Shedd, becomes most incomprehensible precisely at the point where the God who created the physical world subservient to the mind of man, also, by permissive determination, made certain the fall of man. Thereby the created universe became the home of a rational creature incapable of properly using or enjoying the domain of physical nature created to be subservient to him. In such a world, the Divine decree as expressed in Divine providence is worked out.

God's providence means God's sustaining in being and controlling physical nature, animal creation, all particular existence, and all events in individual life and in human history.[122] Bluntly, this means that God sustains and controls everything and everybody. As Shedd recognized, it meant that God was the cause of the Lisbon earthquake. In the physical sphere, "The Divine Decree makes certain by necessitating."[123] But--and here again we come upon an important difference--it is not so in the human sphere. In the sphere of events which result from human actions, God's providence controls through that mysterious means whereby God, in His Divine decree, brings man's self-determined acts within the Divine plan. Within the sphere of mind and moral

---

122. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 530.

123. Ibid., I, 403.

decision, God decreed self-determined acts for man, and though His decree makes them certain, it does not necessitate them.[124]

Shedd seemed to feel that what has been reported above was not enough to say about providence, for he added this significant paragraph:

According to the Scriptures, preservation is the immediate operation of God as a distinct and different Being, upon, in, and with the creature as a different and distinct being, and always in accordance with the nature of the creature. In the material world, God immediately works in and through material properties and laws. In the world of mind, God immediately works in and through the properties and faculties of mind. Preservation never runs counter to creation. God does not violate in providence what he has established in creation. The Creator, if we may so say, adjusts and accommodates Himself to His creatures, in His providential operation.[125]

It is this idea put concisely in that last sentence, which, had Shedd said anything at all about God's self-limitation in creation, would have made possible a suggestion of Divine self-limitation in providence. But Shedd obviously did not seem to think this was the logical development of the thought expressed above, for he did not allow the implications of these words to enter into his thinking concerning the meaning of either creation or providence. He was too firm in his commitment to the necessity of maintaining the absolute

---

124. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 411.

125. Ibid., I, 528.

immutability of God to allow even for self-imposed change and limitation within and upon the Divine Being. It is for this very reason that his description, exposition, and defense of the Divine decree of creation and providence gives the impression of a system of Divine determinism which is completely self-regarding on the part of God. Here, as in his discussion of the Divine benevolence, Shedd carefully avoided giving the impression that God exercised His power for the good of the creatures over whom He exercised care and control. Thus it is possible to turn back upon Shedd his own words as spoken to the literary societies of the University of Vermont in 1845:

> What meaning have the omnipotence, and even the adaptive intelligence, of the Deity, for me as a religious being . . . . until I know the supernatural character and person who resides in them and makes them the vehicle of his operations? . . . What are the Infinite Power . . . and the Infinite Intelligence . . . to me . . . . until I know who wields them and what supernatural and holy attributes make them their bearer and agent?[126]

Shedd's emphasis upon the necessity of God's absolute sovereignty in creation and providence, and of the reasonable wisdom of it all, made it easy to forget who the Sovereign was, and what was the peculiar character of that wisdom. This same manner of treatment will be seen to have been carried

---

126. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 11.

over into his discussion of the sovereignty of God in predestination.

c. Predestination

Shedd defined predestination as "The Divine Decree so far as it relates to moral agents."[127] He believed that that which Calvin had termed "the decretum horrible (the decree of double predestination)" was a logical necessity. Therefore, he taught both predestination unto life eternal and predestination unto eternal punishment.[128] Predestination and God's foreknowledge are inseparably linked together. In fact, he defined God's foreknowledge as the pre-recognition of a person as one to whom God in His sovereign mercy has determined to give repentance and faith, that is, one whom God has determined to effectually call through the activity of His irresistible grace.[129] It is God's "determination" which is in all respects controlling and decisive. Predestination rests solely upon reasons sufficient to the mind of God![130] It does not rest upon His compassion, for He has compassion

---

127. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 415.

128. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 21.

129. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 416, 417, 427.

130. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 20.

upon the elect and the non-elect alike.[131] Neither does it rest upon man's reaction to common grace. Rather, God's action in bestowing regenerating grace to some and not to others is His sovereign, self-determined action alone! There is no knowing the "why" of it. "Because God so pleaseth" is the reason given by the Confession of Faith. To this Shedd added only: "God's reason, we know, must be a good one. But, it is a secret with Himself."[132] Thus the decree of predestination is to be interpreted purely as an act of God's sovereignty, executed according to His own self-determination.

Nevertheless, it is not to be assumed that God's sovereignty in this matter is unlimited, and that once the fall has taken place God can regenerate men as He chooses. God's sovereignty in regeneration rests entirely upon His own ability to satisfy the demands of His Divine wrath. This Divine wrath, which, as has been said, issues from the constitutional and necessary antagonism between the Divine holiness and moral evil, must be satisfied.[133] Therefore, in order to predestination to redemption, something must be done to satisfy God's justice. Thus arises the "Covenant of

---

131. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 423-424.

132. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 18. See also, Commentary on Romans, pp. 264, 271.

133. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 401. See also, Commentary on Romans, p. 117.

Redemption" in which the contracting parties are the Father and the Son, the First and Second Persons in the Trinity. The Father promises to reward the Son with a kingdom and glory, upon condition that the Son shall perform a work of atonement and redemption. The Son voluntarily agrees to this covenant.[134] In this transaction within the Trinity, to put it another way, God the Father commissions His Only Begotten Son to make possible the redemption of men through satisfying the demands of the Divine justice, and the Only Begotten Son, the Second Person of the Trinity, accepts this commission voluntarily. This Covenant is that upon which all else in redemption depends.[135] Therefore, it must be said, using the terms of sequence (though in the eternal realm, it is to be remembered, all is without succession), until God propitiates, appeases, and satisfies His own wrath, there can be no predestination to redemption, regeneration, or election.[136]

When we look at this action as it is executed in history it can be described as the Second Person of the Trinity becoming the God-man, Christ Jesus, and suffering upon the cross the penalty for sin which alone can satisfy the Divine wrath. The atonement for those against whom the Divine wrath is directed must be made. The nature of this atonement will

---

134. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 360.

135. Ibid., II, 393, 408. 136. Ibid, II, 399.

be discussed under the work of Jesus Christ. It is enough here simply to say that the atonement affords the necessary reason for the extension of forgiveness, without which there can be no predestination to redemption. And, there must be a reason for Divine forgiveness, said Shedd. The Divine compassion must be rational in its exercise, for the Sovereign God is most reasonable.[137] And the Divine wrath must not be outraged.[138]

But even though the work of the Son of God in atonement, which will be described later, will be seen to be a work sufficient for the redemption of the whole of mankind, and even though the atonement is not to be regarded as "limited," still God does not effectually extend its benefits to all.[139] It is right at this point that the Divine discrimination enters to exercise itself with unconditioned freedom.[140] Shedd wrote:

The Divine Father, in giving the Divine Son as a sacrifice for sin, simultaneously determined that this sacrifice should be appropriated through faith by a definite number of the

---

137. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 214. See also, Dogmatic Theology, II, 547.

138. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 272.

139. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 470.

140. Shedd, "The Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of Divine Decree," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, I, 8.

human family, so that it might be said that Christ died for this number with the distinct intention that they should be personally saved by his death.[141]

Thus we have come full round to the earlier position where it was noted that the doctrine of redemption rests solely upon the Divine sovereignty in the bestowal of regenerating grace.

Finding much of his doctrine summed up in Romans 8:29,[142] Shedd took the word "foreknew" as signifying that God "fixes his eyes upon a particular sinful man and selects him, as an individual, to be predestinated to holiness in effectual calling."[143] And, the foreknowledge, predestination, and election of God's sovereign will are all brought to bear upon a man through the agency of God's irresistible grace which inclines a man's will to holy obedience. This activity of God is the act of regeneration, and the holy obedience which results from it is that conversion of man's will which results

---

141. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 476. See also, II, 482-486 and III, 421-246, wherein the argument is simply that no offer of the atonement is possible but a universal, indiscriminate offer. Further see Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 28: "God's desire that sinners would hear his universal call to repentance is unlimited; but his purpose to overcome their unwillingness and incline them to repentance is limited."

142. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate . . . . moreover, them whome he did predestinate, he also called." See Commentary on Romans, pp. 263-266.

143. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 416-417.

in faith and repentance.[144]

There is a sense in which it can be said that Shedd simply repeated, with elaborating comments, the statement in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which reads:

All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, He is pleased, in His appointed and accepted time effectually to call, by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds, spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to what is good; and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace.[145]

In this is to be found Shedd's doctrine of predestination to redemption, holiness, or eternal life as he called it. And his doctrine of predestination to death, or eternal damnation, is but an elaboration of the fact that God freely chooses not to do any of these things for the "non-elect."

Before discussing Shedd's statement of the doctrine of predestination to damnation, or the doctrine of preterition, as he preferred to call it, it should be noticed that Shedd departed from tradition in joining with such men as Lyman Beecher and Charles Hodge in the promulgation of a doctrine

---

144. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 494-495. See also III, 437, and Commentary on Romans, pp. 271-272.

145. Westminster Confession of Faith, XII, 1.

concerning the election and regeneration of all who die in infancy.[146] Concerning this, Shedd said: "We have ground for believing that all of mankind who die in infancy will be regenerated by the Holy Spirit." Then he went on to declare, with sweeping inaccuracy, "The Protestant Church understands the Bible to declare that all who die in infancy die regenerate."[147]

All of this suggests that Shedd's own rigid insistence upon double predestination was indeed such a "decretum horrible" as to shock him into seeking some form of compensation. The form which appeared was the proclamation of this doctrine of the election and regeneration, as a class, of all infants who die in infancy. It had to take some such form, because Shedd was vigorous in his denunciation of those who suggested

---

146. Prentiss, George L, "Theological Implications of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation," Presbyterian Review, IV, 548-580. Here is a clear delineation of matters into which this thesis discussion can not go. The article gives the historical setting of the doctrine as stated by Shedd, Hodge, Beecher, et al.

147. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, pp. 117-133. For examples of the type of argument which Shedd used, note: "The exegesis turns upon the point whether the Saviour's declaration: 'of such is the kingdom of God,' means 'of all such,' or, 'of some such,' . . . We contend that the first is the most natural understanding of the words of Christ" (p. 118). "The antithesis of the Confession's phraseology respecting 'elect infants dying in infancy,' is not 'non-elect infants dying in infancy,' but rather, 'elect infants not dying in infancy'" (p. 118). "All of the elect are elected as infants in the womb!" (p. 119)

[illegible] interpretation of the [illegible] to [illegible].[43] Consequently, [illegible] some critics [illegible] the more general [illegible] that [illegible] and [illegible] importance in the [illegible]." [illegible] Hawthorne, [illegible] example [illegible]. The [illegible] like to [illegible] [illegible].[44]

[illegible] This suggested that [illegible] the [illegible] a [illegible] "Hawthorne [illegible]" of Hawthorne [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible] reported that the [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible].

---

43. [illegible], [illegible], "[illegible] of [illegible] Indian Narratives," [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] is a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

44. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible].

that men "passed by" by God's regenerating grace in this life might have another chance. Shedd insisted that the Divine "passing by" of sinful men, and the eternal punishment which they suffered, were both necessary and integral parts of the Christian system. The doctrine of preterition, as Shedd called it, together with its attendant doctrine of endless punishment, were assumed to be necessary for upholding the reality of the Divine justice and holiness,[148] and equally necessary for the proper appreciation of the great mercy of God in providing a substitute for men, lost in sin, and damned eternally.[149]

Divine preterition, or the Divine "passing by," or predestination unto punishment, Shedd explained in this manner: "When God 'foreordains' a sinner to 'everlasting death,' He decides to leave him in the sin which deserves everlasting death and results in it."[150] This means that preterition is essentially God's inaction, His decision not to do for the non-elect that which He does for the elect. Sometimes Shedd said this bluntly, as: "If God does not elect a person, He

---

148. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, two essays: "The Double Predestination to Holiness and to Sin," and "Preterition and the Lopsided View of the Divine Decree."

149. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 185.

150. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 20.

rejects him."[151] Other times, he was careful to stress the inaction of God and the efficient causality of man, as in these sentences:

> God does nothing to save the non-elect sinner. His action is inaction. God passes the man by, in the bestowment of regenerating grace. . . . This divine inaction, or preterition, is the occasional cause of the sinner's perdition: the efficient cause being the obstinate self-determination of the human will; as a man's doing nothing to prevent a stone from falling, is the occasional cause of its fall, the efficient cause being gravitation. . . . Consequently, mere inaction, or doing nothing, on the part of God, results in an everlasting self-determination to sin on the part of man.[152]

That was the general tenor of Shedd's remarks. He repeated them again and again for the purpose of clearing up what he thought to be misunderstanding. For him, it had to be misunderstanding, for certainly none could object to the doctrine of the sovereignty of God, and, Shedd held, "God's sovereignty is not sovereignty unless He can freely withhold regenerating grace, even as in election, He freely bestows it."[153] Such an emphasis upon absolute sovereignty charac-

---

151. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 431. In I there are some twenty pages devoted to the decree of preterition and in III some twenty additional pages on the same subject.

152. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, ch. ix, vs. 32, pp. 308-309.

153. Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, essay: "Preterition Necessary to the Sovereignty of God in Election," an essay which first appeared in the New York Observer, March 6, 1890.

terizes Shedd, whether he be speaking of predestination to holiness, or predestination to everlasting death.

d. Endless Punishment

"Everlasting death" was not the only term Shedd used to describe the result of this Divine inaction or preterition. A few of the terms he used were "everlasting woe, perpetual misery, damnation, a hell of just woe and wail, ruined forever, and burning in the pure eternal flame." His writing on the subject was considerable. A large portion of the second volume of Dogmatic Theology was given to the subject. He also published a volume entitled The Doctrine of Endless Punishment (1885). He believed that precise and vigorous writing on this theme was one of the real needs of the hour:

> There is no doctrine about which the doubts and skepticism, namely the sincere perplexity of man, hovers more continuously, than the doctrine that man is by nature depraved and deserving of eternal punishment. Probably if the world of unbelievers could be convinced of the truth of this particular tenet, the doubt and unbelief upon all other doctrines would yield. This is the citadel in the fortress of unbelief.[154]

In the chapter dealing with Shedd's doctrine of man it will be shown how vigorously he assaulted this citadel with regard

---

154. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, p. 190.

to the depraved nature of man. Here it will be noted that his vigor was no less in declaring that man not only deserved eternal punishment, but got it. Part of his vigor stemmed from the conviction that "the rejection of the doctrine of Endless Punishment cuts the ground from under the gospel."[155] However, most of his vigor stemmed from his prior commitment to a defense of the necessity of God's wrath and the insistence that justice is the all-controlling attribute of God.[156] In fact, it will be seen that most of the difficulty in Shedd's treatment of endless punishment centers in his preference for the "necessary" and "a priori" elements of truth. The Divine wrath is necessary. It is metaphysically certain, and a rational essential of the Divine Being. Thus, for Shedd it over-rules, in the end, the voluntary attribute of Divine compassion, which, because it is optional, is never so certain nor compelling as that which is rationally and metaphysically necessary.

In his rational defense of the doctrine of endless punishment, Shedd argued that punishment is retribution. It is an aspect of God's retributive justice. Its first and great object is requital. It follows that it must be endless, for

---

155. Shedd, <u>The Doctrine of Endless Punishment</u>, preface, p. vii.

156. Shedd, <u>Dogmatic Theology</u>, I, 370-380.

punishment must continue so long as the reason for it continues. Suffering that is penal can never come to an end because guilt is the reason for its infliction, and guilt, once incurred, never ceases to be. Also, since the guilt of sin against God is strictly infinite, there can be no over-punishment, for the only way in which justice can approximately obtain its dues is by never-ceasing infliction.[157] Shedd wrote:

> If sin be intrinsically damnable, it is intrinsically punishable. If, then, the question be asked: how long is it intrinsically damnable and intrinsically punishable? there is but one answer. There is, in fact, no logical mean between no punishment at all of sin as intrinsic evil, and an absolute, that is, an endless punishment of it.[158]

To relate all of this to the attribute of Divine justice is the following revealing statement:

> The absolute and indefeasible nature of justice is seen by considering the nature of law. If we regard the moral law as the efflux of the Divine Nature, we find this same stark necessity existing. The law is obligated to punish the transgressor as much as the transgressor is obligated to obey the law. . . . Law has no option. Justice has but one function. The necessity of obligation. The law itself is under law; that is, is under the necessity of its own nature; and therefore, the only possible way whereby a transgressor can escape the penalty of law, is for a substitute to endure it for him.[159]

---

157. Shedd, The Doctrine of Endless Punishment, pp. 121-132.

158. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 282.

159. Ibid., p. 287.

This, taken with what has been previously pointed out concerning Shedd's understanding of the attributes of God, makes it clear that there is no option whatever concerning eternal punishment: either God elects a man to receive eternal salvation on the merits of His Son's substitutionary atonement, or man is doomed to suffer endlessly as a transgressor of God's law. Because this is true, Shedd repeatedly insisted that "when God leaves a sinner in his sin and punishes him, the attribute of Divine Justice is glorified."[160]

However clear all of this was to Shedd, it seems to involve a contradiction unresolved. In the manner of the scholastics, Shedd spent considerable time showing that the quantity and quality of the suffering of Jesus Christ was such as should satisfy justice for the sins of all mankind.[161] Although he had insisted that the exercise of the attribute of mercy was dependent upon the appeasement of the Divine wrath, he also said, "all the legal obstacles to the exercise of this great attribute have been removed by the death of the Son of God for the sins of the whole world."[162] Nevertheless, according to Shedd, God, whose Divine wrath has been appeased by the atonement offered by His Son, still demands the endless

---

160. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 448.

161. Ibid., II, 412-424.

162. Shedd, Doctrine of Endless Punishment, p. 749.

suffering of those upon whom He Himself did not choose to bestow regenerating grace. Shedd recognized that this would be called an inconsistency, but he said this was only evidence of the critics' misunderstanding:

> It is urged that when the unbeliever is personally punished, after an infinite vicarious satisfaction for human sin has been made, justice in this case gets more than its dues; which is as injust as to get less. This is a mathematical objection, and must get a mathematical answer. The alleged excess in the case is like the addition of a finite number to infinity, which is no increase. The everlasting suffering of all mankind, and still more, of only a part, is a finite suffering. Neither the sufferer, nor the duration, is mathematically infinite; for the duration begins, though it does not end. But, the suffering of the God-man is mathematically infinite because His person is absolutely infinite. Therefore, any amount of finite human suffering, if added to the infinite suffering of the God-man, is no increase of value. Justice, mathematically, gets no more penalty when the suffering of lost men is added to that of Jesus Christ than it would without this addition.[163]

Nevertheless, on Shedd's own terms which insisted that "the endless suffering of finite human beings, just because it is the suffering of finite human beings, can never hope to satisfy the Divine Wrath," it is still a question: "Why should the Divine Wrath continue endlessly the punishment of finite beings which, at best, can but approximately satisfy it?" For this question, Shedd had no clear answer.

All of this brings out that further inconsistency which, when pointed out, becomes the logical place to conclude this

---

163. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 444.

chapter on Shedd's doctrine of God. Shedd presents God's desire to save sinners as great. But, it is not great enough to do the one thing needful: extend to them regenerating grace. Shedd said: "The infinite pity of God is yearning with a fathomless desire to save the transgressor from the effects of His Divine displeasure."[164] By Shedd's definition, the only way in which this thing for which the infinite pity of God yearns to happen, is for God to provide the substitute, which He did, and also, to apply the benefits wrought by that substitutionary atonement to the sinner through the bestowing of regenerating grace. This latter thing, God does not do--obviously because that infinite pity did not move Him to do so!

Of course, this only highlights the manner in which Shedd fell into the Augustinian error of thinking of God in terms of omnipotence and irresistible grace. To blame the sinner's hardness of heart[165] for all this endless suffering in hell is not nearly so easy to do when a God of pity has no obstacles whatever in His way to placing over against this hardness of heart the power of irresistible grace.

Thus it is that Shedd presents a picture of God who, though omnipotent, ends up with neither the satisfaction of

---

164. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 270.

165. Shedd, The Doctrine of Endless Punishment, pp. 749, 151.

His infinite pity toward all men, nor the satisfaction of His divine wrath against sin. And, for this predicament, an odd one for an omnipotent, omniscient Deity, the God Shedd presents has no one to blame but Himself.

Chapter IV

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST

1. A Professed Chalcedonian

We teach that Jesus Christ is perfect as respects godhood and perfect as respects manhood; that he is truly God and truly a man consisting of a rational soul and a body; that he is consubstantial with the Father as to his divinity, and consubstantial with us as to his humanity, and like us in all respects, sin excepted. He was begotten of the Father before creation, as to his deity; but in these last days he was born of Mary, the mother of God, as to his humanity. He is one Christ, existing in two natures without mixture, without change, without division, without separation, the diversity of the two natures not being at all destroyed by their union in the person, but the peculiar properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring to one person, and one subsistence . . . .[1]

This was Shedd's brief description of the statement of the Council of Chalcedon concerning the person of Jesus

---

1. Shedd, History of Doctrine, II, 269.

Christ. He believed that all this statement needed in his day was that it should be accurately presented and confidently defended before the bar of reason. His appraisal of the statement of Chalcedon was:

> The Chalcedon divines were enabled to combine all the Scripture data relating to the Incarnation, into a form of statement that has been accepted by the Church universal ever since, and beyond which it is probable the human mind is unable to go in the endeavor to unfold the mystery of Christ's complex Person.[2]

In view of his commitment to Protestant scholastic orthodoxy, it is not surprising that he held this position. So far as he was concerned, it was the position which had been ably defended by the best minds in the Christian Church, from Athanasius and Cyril to Hooker and Howe. Also, it was the position which he believed that the Westminster Confession repeated when it said:

> The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof; yet without sin: being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance. So that two whole, perfect, distinct natures, in the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God, and very man, yet one Christ . . . .[3]

---

2. Shedd, History of Doctrine, I, 408.

3. Westminster Confession of Faith, VIII, 2.

However much Shedd confessed these statements to be adequate, he did not simply repeat them when he presented his own theological viewpoint. And, in his statement and defense of these teachings of the Council of Chalcedon and the Westminster Assembly, he placed peculiar emphasis upon the uniqueness of Jesus Christ.

2. Emphasis upon Uniqueness

Shedd interpreted the statement of Chalcedon to have proclaimed Jesus Christ neither a human person, nor a divine person, but a "theanthropic person."[4] As the one and only theanthropic person in the whole universe, Jesus Christ was absolutely unique. However, this uniqueness of the total person of Christ was not enough uniqueness for Shedd. His interest was in defending the position that "in all respects" Jesus Christ was unique. He held and defended this position by making three particular emphases: (a) the absolute uniqueness of the human nature of Jesus Christ; (b) the uniqueness of the manner in which the divinity of Jesus Christ controlled the humanity of Jesus Christ; and (c) the uniqueness of the self-consciousness of Jesus Christ. It is by way of these three emphases that the impact of the Person of Christ as presented by Shedd is really to be felt.

---

4. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 401.

a. The Human Nature

The human nature of Jesus Christ, according to Shedd, is absolutely unique. There is none other like it. In the first place, it was unique in conception. "This miraculous conception was as pure from all sensuous quality as the original creation of Adam's body from the dust of the ground."[5] This miraculous conception, this Virgin Birth, though under attack in that time, was nevertheless proclaimed by Shedd to be a "fundamental article of the Christian faith," yea, even the very "basis of evangelical Christianity."[6] It was in this unique conception, the Virgin Birth, that Shedd founded the uniqueness of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

This miraculous conception, however, was not enough to insure that the human nature, provided of "Mary's substance," should be properly sanctified before its assumption by the Second Person of the Trinity. Therefore, said Shedd, "We must postulate a renewing and sanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit in connection with his quickening energy."[7] In the interest of insuring the uniqueness of the humanity of Jesus, Shedd added to the miraculous conception a special

---

5. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 303.
6. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, pp. 156-157.
7. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 304.

sanctifying activity on the part of the Holy Spirit. This, though Shedd would not admit it, was his counterpart to what the Roman Catholics postulate concerning the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary. In both cases the desire is to insure for Jesus Christ a unique human nature.

The uniqueness of the humanity of Jesus Christ was further insured by Shedd when he insisted that the human nature which the Second Person of the Trinity assumed in the Incarnation was not individualized or personalized human nature, as is the case in other births, but was "simple, unindividualized, unpersonalized" human nature.[8] Just what Shedd meant by this must be gained from his own words:

> When we speak of a human nature, a real substance having physical, rational, moral, and spiritual properties is meant. This human nature or substance, is capable of becoming a human person, but as yet is not one. It requires to be personalized, in order to be a self-conscious individual man. . . . Before this personalization it has all the qualities of the common mass of which it is a part, but, it is not yet individualized. . . . It is the properties of a substance that make it what it is, not the particular individual form that it may assume. . . . As Turretin says: "We measure the reality and dignity of a human nature by the essential properties of the nature, not by the characteristics of individuality subsequently added to it" . . . . These properties, which subsequently appear in the particular individual formed of it, are: Spirituality, rationality, voluntariness --viewing the nature upon the psychical side of it--and sensuousness with general adaptation to a visible and material world--viewing the nature upon the physical side. . . . The

---

8. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 284. See also, II, 269, 289.

fact that the nature has all the properties of man, though it has not as yet the form of an individual man, is sufficient to make it human nature.[9]

It is this human nature, as described by Shedd, which was "actually personalized and made to have an individual life and history by being miraculously quickened, formed, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and assumed by the Eternal Logos into union with himself."[10]

The uniqueness of the humanity of Jesus is not exhausted by all of these circumstances and conditions that pertained to it before it was assumed by the Logos. According to Shedd, the human nature assumed by the Second Person of the Trinity was made more unique by this very assumption. Although the Council of Chalcedon had said, through the statement made concerning the person of Christ, that the "incarnation brings together two natures without change," Shedd wrote: "The incarnation produces a change in the humanity it assumed, by exalting and glorifying it."[11] In his Commentary on Romans, Shedd quoted with approval the statement by South that "it was Christ's Divinity which sanctified, consecrated, and hypostatically deified his humanity."[12] Shedd carried

---

9. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 289-291.

10. Ibid., II, 293. 11. Ibid., II, 280.

12. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, ch. 1, vss. 3 and 4, p. 11.

[illegible] that the nature has all the properties [illegible] of the human [illegible] individual [illegible] [illegible].

In this human nature, as described by Gredt, which was actually personalized and made to have an individual life [illegible] subsistency by being miraculously [illegible], formed, and sanctified by the holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, [illegible] assumed by the Word [illegible].[9]

The [illegible] of the humanity of Jesus is not [illegible] [illegible] circumstances and conditions [illegible] [illegible] it was assumed by the Logos. [illegible] [illegible], the human nature assumed by the second Person of the [illegible] was made more unique by this very condition. Although the Council of Chalcedon had [illegible] [illegible] concerning the person of Christ, that the [illegible] [illegible] two natures [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] produces a change in the humanity [illegible] [illegible] and glorifying it.[11] In the [illegible] of [illegible], Hodd quoted with approval the statement [illegible] "It was Christ's Divinity which sanctified, [illegible] and hypostatically deified his humanity."[12] [illegible]

---

9. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], p. [illegible].

10. Ibid., II, 263. 11. Ibid., [illegible].

12. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], Ch. 1, Vol. 3 and 4.

this same idea further in a sermon. He said: "Our Saviour was God, with all His attributes manifested in the flesh. . . . The human nature which he assumed is transformed, transfigured, and glorified by this indwelling of divinity and becomes its white and glistening raiment."[13] In short, for Shedd, the "holy phenomenon of Christ's life in the flesh" is a continuing transfiguration appearance.

b. The Divine Control

The Divinity of Christ not only transformed the human nature of Jesus Christ, but also is to be regarded as omnipotently controlling the human nature of Christ. This was the position which Shedd took, and maintained. Accepting the simple logic of the priority of "the Word" in the phrase, "the Word became flesh," Shedd said, "It is the immutable divinity which constitutes the foundation of Christ's personality."[14] Shedd kept this in the foreground no matter what facet of the person of Christ he described or discussed.

That the Divinity of Christ was omnipotently controlling in the person of Christ came out most forcefully in the manner in which Shedd treated the impeccability of Christ.

---

13. Shedd. Sermons to the Spiritual Man, p. 248.

14. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 272. See also III, 380.

Shedd defended the view that Jesus Christ was characterized by being unable to sin. "He was unable to be overcome by temptation."[15] The clearest picture of this particular emphasis was contained in these words:

> The truth of the doctrine of Christ's impeccability appears from a consideration of the constitution of his person. The divine nature is both intemptable and impeccable. The human nature is both temptable and peccable. When these two natures are united in one theanthropic person, as they are in the incarnation, the divine determines and controls the human, not the human the divine. The amount of energy, therefore, which the total person possesses to resist temptation must be measured not by the human, but by the divine. . . . Jesus Christ was impeccable due to the omnipotent and immutable holiness of the Logos in His person.[16]

Shedd's position, here, is not to be interpreted as a denial that a human will existed in Jesus Christ. There was a finite will in this theanthropic person, and "the finite will never for an instant antagonizes the infinite will, but obeys it perfectly."[17] A further explanation of this position was made in this manner:

> By reason of the intimate personal union of the two natures, neither will work without the other's participation in the efficiency. If the human will acts, the divine will submits and co-acts. This is the humiliation of the divine. If the

---

15. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 330-349.

16. Shedd, "The Impeccability of Christ," Presbyterian Review, IX (1888), 557, 558, 560.

17. Ibid., p. 559.

[illegible] the view that [illegible] was [illegible]
[illegible] being unable to sin. "[illegible] to be overcome by
temptation."[15] The [illegible] picture of [illegible]
[illegible] in these words:

> [illegible] the doctrine of Christ's impeccability [illegible] a consideration of the constitution of His person. [illegible] nature is both [illegible] and impeccable. [illegible] nature is [illegible] temptable and peccable. [illegible] are united in one theanthropic person, [illegible] the divine [illegible] the [illegible] possesses [illegible] to resist [illegible] . . . [illegible] was impeccable due to the [illegible] of the Logos in His person."[16]

Hodge's position, here, is not to be interpreted as a [illegible] will existed in Jesus Christ. [illegible] instant [illegible] the infinite Will, [illegible] perfectly."[17] A [illegible] explanation of this [illegible] was [illegible] in this manner:

> [illegible] because of the intimate personal union of the two natures, [illegible] will [illegible] without the [illegible] in the [illegible]. If the human will [illegible], the divine will [illegible]. This is the [illegible] of [illegible].

---

15. [illegible], Dogmatic Theology, [illegible].

16. Shedd, "The Impeccability of Christ," [illegible] (18[illegible]), 557, [illegible].

17. Ibid., p. 557.

divine will acts, the human will submits and co-acts. This is the exaltation of the human. . . . And, as the human will in Christ was sinless, there was no antagonism between it and the divine will.[18]

This last sentence shows that the impeccability of Jesus Christ is not only evidence of the omnipotent control exercised by the divinity of Christ over the humanity, but is also evidence to the effectiveness of the miraculous activity which attended the birth of Christ. So, in this particular teaching there is a conjoining of the two emphases which have been discussed: the absolute uniqueness of the human nature of Jesus Christ, and the omnipotent control of the Divinity over the humanity in Christ.

As a bridge from this section to the next, in the interpretation of Shedd's understanding of the Person of Jesus Christ, it will be helpful to note the concern that Mark 13:32 caused Shedd. In this portion of Mark's Gospel, Jesus confessed His ignorance of the day of the last Judgment. For "God, with all His attributes, manifested in the flesh," as Shedd had called Christ, to be ignorant concerning anything, was a source of troublesome concern to Shedd. He discussed this in his treatment of the Deity of the Son, again in relation to the omnipotent control of the Divinity over the humanity in the person of Christ, and again in relation to

---

18. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 328.

with sense, the [illegible] will [illegible] of the human. . . . So, as the [illegible] character was sinless, there was no antagonism between it and the divine will.[41]

This last sentence shows that the impeccability of Jesus Christ is not only evidence of the omnipotent control exercised by the divinity of Christ over the humanity, but is also evidence to the effectiveness of the miraculous activity which attended the birth of Christ. So, in this particular [illegible] there is a combining of the two emphases which have been discussed: the absolute sinlessness of the human nature of Jesus Christ, and the omnipotent control of the divinity over the humanity, in Christ.

As a bridge from this section to the next, in the interpretation of Shedd's understanding of the person of Jesus Christ, it will be helpful to note the concern that Mark [illegible] caused Shedd. In this portion of Mark's Gospel, Jesus confesses His ignorance of the day of the last Judgment. [illegible] with all His attributes, manifested in the [illegible] [illegible] Christ, to be [illegible] concerning [illegible] of troublesome concern to Shedd. He discusses [illegible] in his treatment of the deity of the Son, again in relation to the omnipotent control of the divinity over the humanity in the person of Christ, and again in relation to

41. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, [illegible].

the whole idea of the growth of Jesus in wisdom and in knowledge. In each discussion these two general answers emerge: (1) this "ignorance" may well have been something which Christ was not authorized to declare;[19] or (2) it may well have been something that the Divine Logos simply did not make known to the human consciousness of Jesus. Shedd described this latter position in this manner:

> The knowledge of the God-man depended upon the divine nature for its amount. . . . The human mind of Christ could know no more of the secret things of God than the illumination of the Logos made known. The finite and limited human nature hindered a full manifestation of the omniscience of the deity. This part of the humiliation of the eternal Logos . . . For example, the Logos knew the time of the day of judgment, but he did not at a particular moment make that knowledge part of the human consciousness of Jesus Christ . . . . The Gospels mention no instance of Christ's ignorance excepting that respecting the day of judgment; supposing this to be an instance of ignorance.[20]

This explanation is quite in line with Shedd's suggestion that Christ's growth in wisdom and knowledge is referable to the gradually controlling activity of the Divinity in Christ upon the humanity in Christ. For example, Shedd spoke of the illumination and "instruction of the humanity by the divinity."[21] Then he enlarged upon the whole subject by saying: "The Logos constantly existed in Jesus Christ, but

---

19. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 319.

20. Ibid., II, 272. 21. Ibid., II, 277.

did not constantly act through his human soul and body."[22] When this is declared, there is more in it than a mere explanation for an "instance of ignorance." Here is a suggestion of a Person who sometimes was the Logos in action, and sometimes a human person in action!

c. The Alternating Self-Consciousness

The third of the peculiar emphases Shedd made concerning the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, was that regarding the self-consciousness of Jesus. He said: "In the complex person of Christ there was a continual fluctuation of consciousness, according as the divine or the human was uppermost, so to speak, in the self-consciousness."[23] According to Shedd, there were, in Jesus Christ, two kinds of self-consciousness: one human, and one divine. His best statement of this position is as follows:

> The God-man has a two-fold consciousness: infinite and finite. He thinks like God; and he thinks like man. He has the eternal, all-comprehending, and successionless consciousness of God, and he has the imperfect, gradual, and sequacious consciousness of man. In this way, the trinitarian relations of the Second Person remain unchanged by his incarnation. The divine nature, though it condescends to exist

---

22. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 274.

23. Ibid., II, 321.

and act in and through a human soul and body, and to be trammelled by it, at the same time is existing and acting in an untrammelled manner throughout the universe of finite being, and in the immensity of the Godhead.[24]

In order for Shedd, in his own words, to make clear just what he meant by this "continual fluctuation of consciousness," it is necessary to reproduce a long quotation, reading:

Our Lord had two natures: a divine and a human. The union of these, at the incarnation, constitutes the God-man; the Jesus Christ who says "I." By reason of these two natures, He will have two general forms or modes of consciousness, the divine and the human, according as the one or the other nature furnished the elements of consciousness. When the human nature yields the elements of the particular consciousness, and determines the particular experience of the moment, the Jesus Christ hungers, thirsts, sorrows, rejoices, and expresses his consciousness accordingly. When the divine nature determines the form of consciousness at a particular moment, Jesus Christ commands the raging sea to be still, and it obeys; says, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." "Before Abraham was, I am." In this way there was, in the complex person of our Lord, a continual fluctuation of consciousness, or variation of experience, according as the divine or human nature was uppermost, if we may so speak. At one moment he felt, spake, and acted like a feeble, dependent, and finite creature; at another moment, perhaps the very next, He felt, spake, and acted like the almighty and self-subsistent Creator. The finite and the infinite, man and God, the creature and Creator, met and mingled in that wonderful Person who was not divine solely, or human solely, but Divine-human.[25]

Through this "alternation in the self-consciousness" of Jesus

---

24. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 282.

25. Shedd, Review of Crosby, "The True Humanity of Christ," Presbyterian Review, I (1881), 433. See also, Dogmatic Theology, III, 393.

[illegible] any person through [illegible]
[illegible]ersonality it, at the same time [illegible]
[illegible] suprapersonal nature throughout [illegible]
[illegible], and in the immensity of [illegible]."

[illegible] for Christ, in [illegible]

[illegible] means by this "continual incarnation of [illegible],"

[illegible] is necessary to reproduce a [illegible]

[illegible] Lord has two natures [illegible]. The union
[illegible] Christ, at the Incarnation, [illegible]
[illegible] Christ who says "I." By [illegible],
[illegible] will have two general forms of [illegible],
[illegible] and the world, according to [illegible]
[illegible] dominated the elements of consciousness. [illegible]
[illegible] nature shows the elements of the particular [illegible]-
[illegible], and determines the personal experience of the [illegible],
[illegible] whole Christ [illegible], [illegible]
[illegible] consciousness [illegible]
[illegible] determines the form of consciousness [illegible]
[illegible], Jesus Christ comprehends [illegible]
[illegible], says, "My Father [illegible] and I work."
[illegible] was, I am." [illegible]
[illegible] person of our Lord, a [illegible]-
[illegible], or variation of experience, [illegible]
[illegible] of human nature [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible], and finite creature; [illegible]
[illegible], speaks, and stood [illegible]
[illegible] Creator. The [illegible]
[illegible], the creature and Creator, [illegible]
[illegible] person who was not [illegible]
[illegible]n.[32]

[illegible] this "alternation in the [illegible]-consciousness" of Jesus

---

31. [illegible], [illegible] Doctrine, [illegible].

32. [illegible], "The [illegible] of
[illegible]," [illegible] Review, I ([illegible]), [illegible].
[illegible]

Christ, Shedd emphasized further the uniqueness of the Person of Jesus Christ.

3. A Chalcedonian with Differences?

Although it is not pertinent at this time to seek to evaluate the position of the Council of Chalcedon concerning the Person of Jesus Christ, it is pertinent to state those things which seem naturally to lead to the conclusion that when such paradoxes as were contained in the statement of Chalcedon are resolved into reasonable explanations and minute descriptions, the end result is either increased contradiction, or a lop-sided distortion of the original position. This is exemplified in two distinct results of the emphases made by Shedd in the presentation of what he believed to be the position of Chalcedon.

In the first place, the humanity of Jesus as presented by Shedd, is not a humanity which can be said to be "like us in all respects, sin excepted." The humanity of the theanthropic person described by Shedd did not share with the rest of humanity in either the activity of the mind, or the will.

The humanity of the Person described by Shedd did not receive knowledge in the manner that other men do. Although this has been pointed out in that portion of the presentation which dealt with the "instance of ignorance" on the part of Jesus Christ, it is further focused when Shedd "explained

away," as it were, the natural dependence of Jesus upon the Heavenly Father. This natural dependence, though more inclusive, would, of course, include the means of getting knowledge. And, were Jesus presented as at all times naturally dependent upon the Father, His humanity would have been more like ours. But, Shedd's very manner of exegesis in this respect tends to separate Jesus' humanity further from ours, and that at the very point where the Scriptures seem to make Jesus most like men. When Christ is recorded as saying: "The Son can do nothing of himself," this is interpreted by Shedd to mean that Jesus cannot work in isolation or separation from the Father, as if he were another Being. And, says Shedd, this is the meaning of the similar statement: "I do nothing of myself, but as the Father hath taught me, I speak these things."[26] Thus, in respect to the important matter of how He got His knowledge, the Jesus Christ described by Shedd is definitely not like the rest of humanity.

In like manner, Shedd's treatment of the impeccability of Jesus Christ showed that the will of the sinless Christ has in it nothing which it shares in common with the human will in its cooperation with God in the overcoming of sinfulness. Overcoming sin, in terms understandable to men who know their own situation along the pathway to sanctification,

---

26. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 323.

always means some kind of voluntary surrender of the human will to the will of God. This surrender is a moment by moment matter, and is always somewhat of an achievement, even if only the achievement of being passive before God's will. But, there is nothing of this in the Christ that Shedd presented. For Shedd, sinlessness in Jesus Christ was a metaphysical necessity. It was not so much a virtue to glory in, as a fact to be recognized as other metaphysically necessary facts are recognized. Therefore, if Christ be impeccable, by necessity of his very constitution, it is clear that He did not share the temptable and peccable humanity common to others. Hence, from Shedd's point of view, the Westminster Confession of Faith is in error in suggesting that Jesus was "one having all the . . . common infirmities of human nature."[27]

Therefore, in these two respects at least it must be said that Shedd's presentation of the position of Chalcedon makes it very hard to reconcile his description of the humanity of Jesus Christ with that which declared that in His humanity, Jesus Christ was "like us in all respects, sin excepted."

In the second place, the "alternating consciousness" theory that Shedd expounded actually works to keep the two

---

27. Westminster Confession of Faith, VIII, 2.

natures separated. The theory is rooted in the desire to keep the immutability of the Second Person of the Godhead unimpaired, and it succeeds. But, it works out in such a manner that the "I" spoken by Jesus Christ is, from the point of view of Shedd, really never an "I" which denotes the whole theanthropic person![28] Maybe, since the statement of Chalcedon does insist that "no mixture" is to be charged to the two natures in one person, this interpretation of Shedd is right. But, it seems that unless there is some way suggested whereby Jesus can be conscious of Himself as the God-man, He cannot be truly a self-conscious person, that is, a person perfectly conscious of Himself, as He is!

Shedd, in his treatment of the nature of God, insisted that personality is marked by the characteristic of self-consciousness. Therefore, it seems that if it had been possible for him to do so, he would have given at least some indication as to how Jesus Christ could be, or was, at one and the same time, conscious of himself as human and divine, a theanthropic person. Instead, Shedd emphasized the theory of alternating consciousness in such a manner that it is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of an instant when either the human or the divine form of consciousness was not, as Shedd said, "uppermost," and therefore dominating the

---

28. Shedd, Review of Crosby, "The True Humanity . . . ," <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 433.

[illegible]ed. This theory is quoted in the desire to [illegible]
[illegible]ility of the [illegible] of this [illegible]
[illegible] it [illegible]. Now, it works out in such a [illegible]
[illegible] "I" spoken by Jesus Christ is, from the point
[illegible], really never an "I" which denotes the whole
[illegible] person![23] [illegible], since the [illegible]
[illegible] that "no mixture" is to be charged to the
[illegible] in one person, this interpretation of [illegible] is
[illegible]. [illegible] it seems that unless there is [illegible]
[illegible] can be conscious of himself as the [illegible]
[illegible] a self-conscious person, that is, a person
[illegible]ly [illegible] of himself, as he is!

[illegible], in his treatment of the nature of [illegible], insisted
[illegible]lity is marked by the characteristic of self-
[illegible]. Therefore, it seems that if it had been pos-
[illegible] to do so, he would have given [illegible] some
[illegible] to how Jesus Christ could be, or was, at the
[illegible] same time, conscious of himself as [illegible] and divine,
[illegible]ple person. Instead, Shedd [illegible] the theory
[illegible]ing consciousness in such a manner that it is
[illegible], if not impossible, to conceive of [illegible]
[illegible] or the divine form of consciousness [illegible]
[illegible] id, "[illegible]," and therefore [illegible]

---

[23]. [illegible], Review of Cross, "The True [illegible]ity . . . .
[illegible]

self-consciousness to such an extent that the "person" was conscious of himself as God, or as man, but never as God-man. This difficulty, it seems, is inherent in the theory of alternating consciousness, and therefore it renders that theory a hindrance to the proper appreciation of that which was sought in the statement of Chalcedon.

One further point should be made concerning the position of Shedd with regard to the person of Jesus Christ. For Shedd, the significance of the Incarnation was exhausted by the words of Jesus Christ, and the death of Christ. It did not enter into his system of thought that the "fact" of the Incarnation was itself revealing, or that the life of Christ Incarnate was revealing. In this regard, it is interesting to compare a statement by Channing with a statement by Shedd. After he had spoken of the idea of God becoming man in Christ as an idea beneath the dignity of both God and man, Channing said that such a thing--

> would mean that God believed man incapable of holding fast to the doctrine of a purely spiritual Deity and had therefore become man and allowed his Divinity to be colored more by his visible, tangible, corporeal Presence, than by His comparatively hidden, invisible, and spiritual Presence.[29]

In an interesting sermon entitled "Faith With and Without Sight," Shedd said:

---

29. Channing, William E., Channing's Works (Boston, single-volume edition, 1900), pp. 388-389.

> Our Lord implies that those who believe in Him and His word without the aid of those sensible manifestations which were enjoyed by Thomas and his fellow believers receive a greater blessing than they did. . . . Our faith must, therefore, rest more completely on the authority of God. And here is the greater strength and support of the modern faith. The inward powers of the soul are nobler than the five senses; and their acts have more worth and dignity than the operations of the senses. Reason is a higher faculty than is sense. . . . Faith, in its higher and stronger actings, goes back to the rational idea and intrinsic nature of God. The mind reposes upon God simply and alone. . . . Faith in such cases terminates upon the very personality and nature of God.[30]

Although the specific work of Jesus Christ to which Shedd had reference in this particular sermon was the miraculous work of Christ, it is, nevertheless, indicative that he, like Channing, was not inclined to think that the reason of man is much in need of the Incarnation as a revealing fact. Both were intellectuals. And, as Shedd said, in "its higher and stronger actings, faith goes back to the rational idea and intrinsic nature of God."

This means that for Shedd the Person of Christ is not definitive for an understanding of God. Rather, the previously defined and described immutable Second Person of the Trinity was determinative both in the Person of Christ, and in Shedd's understanding of that Person. For this reason, Shedd disavowed the Christological approach to theology which was having a revival in his time. This disavowal provides a

---

30. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, pp. 157, 160, 161, 162.

fitting conclusion to this presentation of Shedd's interpretation of the Person of Jesus Christ. Shedd wrote:

During the present century another method has been adopted by some theologians, namely, the Christological God incarnate is made the basis of theological science, and the work of redemption controls the investigation. This is virtually Schleiermacher's method. . . . Rothe's method is essentially Christological. . . . Among English writers, Chalmers employs the Christological method. The American theologian, H. B. Smith, adopts it. Edwards' History of Redemption may be regarded as a system of theology in this class. . . . While this method is interesting because it makes sin and salvation the principal theme and brings Christ the Redeemer into the foreground, yet it is neither a natural nor a logical method. God incarnate is only a single person of the Godhead; redemption is only one of the works of God; and sin is an anomaly in the universe, not an original and necessary fact. The Christological method, therefore, is fractional. . . . It is not logical or natural to build a science upon one of its divisions. Christology is a division of theology.[31]

In this way Shedd defended his theological method. But he did more. He disclosed that his preference for those "necessary" and "metaphysical" truths had inclined him to make his description of the Person of Jesus Christ a description of that which is necessarily conditioned by the previously defined and described immutable Second Person of the Trinity. In this way it happened that for Shedd the Person of Christ is not considered to be definitive for an understanding of God.

---

31. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 5-6.

[illegible] to this presentation of [illegible] interpre-

[illegible] of the lapsus of [illegible].

[illegible] the present century [illegible] method has been [illegible] theologians, namely, [illegible] the basis of [illegible] theological science, [illegible] controls the [illegible]. This is [illegible]'s method. . . . [illegible]. . . . Among [illegible] the [illegible]logical method. [illegible] Smith adopts it. [illegible] regarded as a system of theology in this sense. . . . [illegible] this method is interesting because it [illegible] the principal [illegible] and brings [illegible] the [illegible], yet it is [illegible] a [illegible] method. [illegible] is only a single portion of [illegible] in any [illegible]; and [illegible] exactly in the [illegible], not [illegible]. [illegible] Christological method, [illegible] . . . [illegible] is not logical or [illegible] to be [illegible] a [illegible]. Christology is a division [illegible] theology.[14]

[illegible] defended his theological method. But [illegible] we [illegible] that his preference for these "[illegible] [illegible]" and "[illegible]physical" [illegible] led him to make [illegible] description of the [illegible] of [illegible] a [illegible] which is necessarily conditioned by the [illegible] limited [illegible] it happened that [illegible] the [illegible] to be [illegible] for [illegible].

14. [illegible]

Chapter V

MAN AS CREATED AND AS FALLEN

1. Man's First Estate

When Shedd thought of man, he thought predominantly of man as sinner. "Anthropology is principally concerned with the doctrine of sin,"[1] he wrote as he began that section of his Dogmatic Theology which dealt with man as created and man as he had become by his own self-determination. Shedd, however, had not waited until this stage of his development to arrive at the conclusion suggested by the above quotation. At least three times in his introductory essay to the Works of Coleridge, Shedd referred to the fact that "a profound view of sin is the deep and strong soil from which all sound,

---

1. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 4.

Chapter V

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

[illegible] of sin,"[1] he wrote [illegible] which dealt with man as [illegible] and because by his own self-determination [illegible] these times in his introductory essay to the [illegible] referred to [illegible] is the deep and strong self from which all sound,

[1] [illegible]

healthy, and healing growth in theological speculation shoot up."[2] As early in his ministry as 1852 Shedd wrote:

> If the church and the ministry of the present day need any one thing more than another, it is profound views of sin; and if the current theology of the day is lacking in any one thing, it is in that thorough-going, that truly philosophic, and at the same time, truly edifying theory of sin, which runs like a strong muscular cord through all the soundest theology of the church.[3]

It was to present such a view of sin, and meet the need of the church and ministry of his day, that Shedd expounded and defended the anthropology which follows.

For Shedd, anthropology began with the Genesis account of man's creation, which he interpreted to mean that "The Creator first enlivened inorganic matter into a body, and then created a rational spirit which He infused into it."[4] This man who was body and soul, was "in God's image." According to Shedd this meant that man, at creation, was endowed "with an understanding enlightened in the spiritual knowledge of God and divine things, and a will wholly inclined to them."[5] This condition Shedd called "positive holiness."[6] Positive

---

2. Shedd, "Introductory Essay," <u>Works of Coleridge</u>, I, 37-38, 45, 50.

3. Shedd, <u>Theological Essays</u>, p. 264. (The essay, "Sin a Nature and That Nature Guilt" first appeared in the <u>Christian Review</u> in 1852.)

4. Shedd, <u>Dogmatic Theology</u>, II, 5.

5. <u>Ibid</u>., II, 99.

6. <u>Ibid</u>., II, 96.

holiness included innocence and more. It meant that man was endowed with the moral image and righteousness of his Creator.[7] The will of man, at creation, was inclined toward holiness.

For Shedd, it was highly important that the nature of the will of man be understood properly. For him, the will is "that governing power in the soul,"[8] and that which constitutes the human soul's "central, active principle, containing the whole moral state, and all the moral affections, . . . a power, in short, which is the man himself--the ego, the person."[9] It is the function of the will in man to determine the whole man with reference to some great and ultimate end of living. "The characteristic of the Will proper, as distinguished from the volitionary faculty, is determination of the whole being to an ultimate end."[10] At creation, man's will was so determined, and in the direction of holiness.

The will of man, however, was not immutably fixed in the direction of holiness at creation. At creation man was placed in pleasant natural surroundings, given all things needful for his continuation in his determination to holiness, and given the freedom to exercise his will according to

---

7. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, II, 13. See also, Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 261.

8. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 231.

9. Ibid., p. 235. 10. Ibid., pp. 233-234.

[illegible] holiness, innocence and [illegible]. [illegible] with the moral image and [illegible] of the crea[illegible]. The will of man, at creation, was inclined toward [illegible].

[illegible] it was [illegible] important [illegible] the nature of the will [illegible] understood properly. [illegible], the will [illegible] "that [illegible] power in the soul,"[6] and [illegible] soul's "central, active principle, [illegible] [illegible] moral state, and all the moral [illegible], . . . a [illegible], in short, which is the man himself--the [illegible] [illegible]."[7] It is the function of the will [illegible] [illegible] with reference to some [illegible] and [illegible] way of living. "The characteristic of the will proper, [illegible] distinguished from the [illegible] faculty, is [illegible] [illegible] it is an [illegible]."[10] [illegible], [illegible] will [illegible] determined, [illegible] in the [illegible] of [illegible].

The will of man, however, was not immutably fixed in [illegible] direction of holiness at creation. [illegible] man was [illegible] [illegible] moral [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] the freedom to [illegible] the will [illegible]

[illegible]

6. [illegible]

7. Ibid., p. [illegible]. 10. Ibid., pp. [illegible].

his own self-determination. In the Garden, where the tree of knowledge was, according to Shedd, an actual tree bearing fruit, man was placed upon probation as God selected that particular tree and, by positive statute, forbade man to eat thereof.[11] Here was man's first opportunity to engage in free self-determination.[12] This opportunity, according to Shedd, was given to man because God desired that man, by the proper exercise of his power of self-determination, might merit immutable holiness, that is, that same kind of holiness which belongs to God only.

The "peril" of this probationary status lay in this: in order to receive as his reward everlasting deliverance from the possibility of sinning, it was necessary that man should not exercise the power to determine himself in the direction of sin.[13] In short, man had within his power the possibility of originating within himself a new inclination of his will.[14] Why this was so, Shedd did not make clear. He did say that the gift of the power to originate sin was

---

11. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 154.

12. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 242 (in which it is made clear that only at this initial point in the history of the human will was there freedom).

13. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 151. See also II, 104, 107, 155.

14. Ibid., II, 155, 151.

[illegible] the self-determination. [illegible]

[illegible], [illegible]

will, and was placed upon probation [illegible]

[illegible] by positive [illegible]

[illegible],[11] [illegible] man's [illegible]

self-determination.[12] This [illegible], according to

[illegible], was given to men because God desired that man, by the

proper exercise of the power of self-determination, [illegible]

immutable holiness, that is, that same kind of holiness

[illegible].

The "spell" of this predicament [illegible] lay in this:

[illegible] in order to resolve as his [illegible] deliverance

from the possibility of sinning, it was necessary that man

should [illegible] exercise the power to determine himself in the

direction of sin.[13] In short, man has within his power the

[illegible] of originating within himself a new inclination

of his will.[14] Why this was so, [illegible] make clear.

[illegible] that the gift of the power to [illegible] sin was

---

11. [illegible], Dogmatic Theology, I, [illegible].

12. [illegible], Theological Essays, p. [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] will [illegible].

13. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 151. See also II, [illegible], 153.

14. Ibid., II, [illegible].

not necessary to the exercise of freedom. He did not suggest that gift of the power to originate sin had been given man as a necessary part of the equipment man needed to "grow a character" (a reason given by others in that day). Shedd only declared that the "possibilitas peccandi" was associated with Adam's primitive state in order to his probation.[15] Thus, as Shedd was not clear concerning why man was created, neither was he clear as to why man was created as he was.

All of this takes on eternal significance for man when it is recognized that, for Shedd, when the word "man" or the name "Adam" is used, the meaning is "all humanity."[16] For Shedd it was a necessity of Christian anthropology that it be recognized that "the whole human race existed a seminal and common nature in the first man."[17] Because this is a basic part of Shedd's anthropology, a quotation is in order. Shedd wrote:

> [Traducianism] refers the creative act mentioned in Genesis 1:27 to the human nature, or race, and not to a single individual merely. It considers the work of creating mankind "de nihilo" as entirely completed upon the sixth day: . . . By this single act, all mankind were created, as to both

---

15. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 151.

16. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, p. 128. See also, Theological Essays, pp. 251-263; Dogmatic Theology, II, 11, 14, 17-18, 181-193.

17. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 262.

[illegible] the exercise of [illegible]

[illegible] the power to [illegible]

[illegible] part of [illegible]

[illegible] given by others in [illegible]

[illegible] the "pestilities [illegible]" was [illegible]

[illegible] in order to [illegible].[15] [illegible]

[illegible] conceptually [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] taken of [illegible] significance [illegible]

[illegible] that, for [illegible]

[illegible], the meaning is "[illegible]."[16] [illegible]

[illegible] was a necessity of [illegible]

[illegible] that "the whole [illegible]

[illegible] in the first man."[17] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

15. [illegible]

16. [illegible]

17. [illegible]

their spiritual and their sensuous substance, in and with the first human pair, and from them have been individually procreated and born, each in his day and generation.[18]

This Traducian theory was espoused by Shedd and defended vigorously. He espoused it because he believed it to be thoroughly Biblical[19] and also to be the only theory adapted to explain both man's creation and man's historic existence in sin.[20]

It was not difficult for Shedd to hold such a theory because he was a Platonic Realist who believed that the Augustinian position on this subject was that of holding to "the real existence of humanity in Adam."[21] Shedd expressed his own theory of "real existence in Adam" as follows:

Human nature is a substance. . . . Human nature is a specific or general substance created in and with the first individuals of a human species, which is not yet individualized, but which by ordinary generation is subdivided into parts, and these parts are formed into distinct and separate individuals of the species. The one specific substance, by propagation, is metamorphosed into millions of individual substances, or persons. An individual man is a fractional part of human

---

18. Shedd, History of Doctrine, II, 13.

19. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, pp. 123, 127, 132-135.

20. Shedd, Review of Dabney's "Syllabus on Theology," Presbyterian Review, I, 392.

21. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, p. 128.

nature separated from the common mass and constituted a particular person having all the essential properties of human nature.[22]

With true consistency, Shedd said: "The Will of Adam was not the Will of a single isolated individual merely: it was also, and besides this, the Will of the human species--the human Will generically."[23]

On this matter it should be said that while Shedd was clearly in agreement with Turretine, the elder, in his espousal of Traducianism, he was in conflict with other American Presbyterian theologians: Hodge, Thornwell, and Dabney.[24] None of these American Presbyterian theologians held that "the real existence of humanity in Adam" was the only satisfactory way to describe created man and still set the stage for the sin and fall of all mankind in Adam. Shedd, however, held this view and believed it to be a shortcoming in the other theologians that they did not.

---

22. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 72.

23. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 253.

24. Peck, T. E., "Review of Shedd's Dogmatic Theology," The Presbyterian Quarterly, III (Richmond, April, 1889), 290-291. This part of the review is given over especially to pointing out Shedd's differences from other theologians of the same general school.

2. The Sin and Fall of Man

"The instant our first parents did eat of the fruit forbidden by positive statute, they transgressed a Divine Command."[25] This, said Shedd, was the first sin. And it was a sin, not of Adam only, but of all mankind in Adam.[26] Thus did all mankind disregard the authority of God and enter on a course of disobedience.[27] No wonder Shedd called this event at the beginning of human history the "most awful and awfully pregnant event."[28] When the evidence of this section of this chapter, together with the testimony of the sections of other chapters on such subjects as "endless punishment" and "the goal of secular history" are considered, it will be seen that this "first transgression" was possibly the most powerful single act in the history which followed upon Creation.

This overt transgression was preceded by an internal action. In this internal action is to be found the real commencement of sin, the principal part of it. This internal action was the origination of a wrong inclination of the will: Adam's will was inclined to self, rather than inclined to God

---

25. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 154.

26. Ibid., II, 17-18. See also, Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 253.

27. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 169.

28. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 253.

[illegible]

"[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible].[25] This, said [illegible], was the [illegible]

[illegible], but of all [illegible].[26] [illegible]

[illegible] disregard [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible].[27] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible].[28] When one [illegible]

[illegible] with the teaching of the section [illegible]

[illegible] as such subjects as "[illegible]" and "[illegible]

[illegible] history" are considered, it will be seen [illegible]

[illegible] "first transgression" was possibly the most powerful

[illegible] in the history [illegible]

This overt transgression was preceded by an internal

[illegible]. In this internal action is to be found the real com-

mencement of sin, the principal part of it. This internal

action was the origination of a wrong [illegible]

[illegible] will was inclined to self, rather than inclined to [illegible]

---

25. [illegible]

26. [illegible]

27. [illegible]

28. [illegible]

as its ultimate end.[29] This self-inclination of Adam's will to self was a clean break with the original inclination of the will to holiness. This is that internal action which is the principal part of the first transgression.

Adam, and all mankind in Adam, by this act of self-determination, not only transgressed a statute of God, but channeled the whole force of human nature away from holiness. In this, Adam was truly "original." There was no sinful antecedent to this inclination of the will, and no prior sin by which to explain it. In fact, it was, said Shedd, "intrinsically improbable" that Adam should take such action. This act had about it the nature of "caprice," for there was nothing natural nor rational about it. It was the divorce of will from reason. Thus, the first sin can not be explained on natural and rational grounds. It must simply be regarded as "man's creation"--an "original creation."[30]

Shedd, following Augustine, went even further than this and suggested that sin must be regarded as "man's unconscious creation." For example, he said:

> . . . . even with regard to Adam himself, the remark of Augustine is true--that he had already fallen before he ate the forbidden fruit. . . . The act of conscious transgression in

---

29. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 171, 169.

30. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 169 n.

the case of Adam sprang from an evil nature that had already been unconsciously generated in his Will.[31]

Then, as if to make the point incontrovertible, Shedd added:

That action of the human will, which is denominated its fall, which lies under the whole sinful history and development of the individual man--which is the ground and source of all his conscious transgression--is, without contradiction, unconscious action.[32]

Which means, it seems, that sin is mankind's unconscious creation. Yet, it is a most powerful creation. Whereas God, in His creation of man, created him with a positive inclination to holiness, man, in this single creative act, originated an inclination of the will which was wholly contrary to God's desire! Further, by this unconscious action of the human will, mankind, every child of Adam, fell into sin, guilt, and slavery, and became justly chargeable with the original wrong-inclination of the will and the subsequent transgression of Divine Law.[33]

For Shedd, the best words to describe the estate into which man fell because of the first sin were those just used: "guilt" and "slavery." Guilt, for Shedd, was not primarily a

---

31. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 248.

32. Ibid., p. 249.

33. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 14. See also, Theological Essays, pp. 251-263, and Commentary on Romans, pp. 123-141.

[illegible]

[illegible] fall of Adam sprang from an evil [illegible] generated in his will."

[illegible], as if to make this point [illegible]:

"[illegible] action of the human will, [illegible]."

[illegible], in sense, [illegible]

[illegible] faculties. Yet, [illegible]

the creation of men, created him with a positive inclin-

toward holiness, men, in this single creative act, originated

[illegible] one will which was wholly contrary to his

nature! Moreover, by this [illegible] action of the human

will, [illegible] every child of Adam, fell into sin, guilt, and

slavery, and [illegible] with the original [illegible]-

[illegible] of the will and [illegible]

[illegible] law.[33]

[illegible], the best words to describe the estate [illegible]

sin and fall because of the first sin [illegible]:

guilt" and "slavery." Guilt, for Shedd, was not primarily [illegible]

---

31. [illegible]

32. Ibid., p. 221.

33. [illegible]

feeling. Guilt was defined to be a state, the "state of deserving punishment," the condition of "being a criminal."[34] In a sense, it could be said that for Shedd, man after the fall is above all else "guilty."[35]

In this respect it is to be noted that for Shedd the chief reason that man stands guilty before God is not that he knows better than he does, though he is guilty for that reason. Nor is the chief reason that man stands guilty before God that he is a daily transgressor of the law of God, though he is guilty for that reason. The chief reason that man stands guilty before God is that in Adam he lost his original righteousness.[36] Man's native depravity, the consequence of man's original sin, is more reason for his deserving punishment than any of his sinful conduct. This guilt, all men have from birth. So did Shedd present man's "guilty state."

The second great consequence of the first sin of mankind was that mankind fell into servitude, into slavery. Using the words of Jesus, "He that committeth sin is the slave of sin (John 8:34)," Shedd preached on the subject: "Sin is

---

34. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 162.

35. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 230.

36. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, p. 277. This whole volume can be said to be illustrative of Shedd's earnestness to show "The Sinfulness of Original Sin."

Spiritual Slavery."[37] Shedd defined slavery to be "an inability to the contrary resulting from a foregoing activity of the Will."[38] Such a definition was mandatory on Shedd because he had said that the will in man is a "voluntary power that carries the whole inward being along with it when it moves."[39] So it is not surprising that every expression of sin decreases the sinner's ability to keep God's law.[40]

So great is the sinner's bondage to sin that the only things which restrain him in his sinfulness are: (1) fear of consequences before an act of transgression, and (2) remorse of conscience after it.[41] Just how sensitive such a view of things is to the actual facts of human conduct is open to question, but it is quite in keeping with Shedd's whole presentation of man's activity. In fact, according to Shedd, God's giving of the law, man's sense of duty, the dictates of man's conscience, unfulfilled aspirations, and fears because of judgment--all of these things, as they impinge upon the sinful will, prove completely ineffectual in working a

---

37. Shedd, <u>Sermons to the Natural Man</u>, pp. 202-230.

38. Shedd, <u>Commentary on Romans</u>, p. 165.

39. Shedd, <u>Theological Essays</u>, p. 235.

40. Shedd, <u>Sermons to the Natural Man</u>, pp. 202-203. Cf. <u>Dogmatic Theology</u>, II, 235-237.

41. Shedd, <u>Commentary on Romans</u>, p. 25.

change in the sinner's fundamental inclination away from holiness.[42] The only positive thing that can come from these things is testimony to the sinner concerning his bondage!

Although this line of reasoning may have been good for preaching and may have been material which the Holy Spirit could use to quicken a sinner to a sense of sin and a need of Divine mercy, it was, after all, simply talk about something which Shedd, by definition, had stated to be a human impossibility--even apart from sin and its bondage! Remember that for Shedd, holiness or righteousness must always proceed from God, and therefore cannot be man's product. So, even apart from sin, man is unable to incline himself toward holiness--for, by definition, only God can do this.[43] Therefore, it is useless to inquire further concerning man's inability and corruption because of the fall. Enough to know that since the fall man is in such a state of guilt, slavery, and condemnation to eternal punishment that nothing can release him except Divine spiritual influences exerted in their highest grade of irresistible grace.[44] It is with this redemption, and the atonement which made it possible, that the next chapter will be concerned.

---

42. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, pp. 209-219; 140-146.

43. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 233-235.

44. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, p. 219.

Chapter VI

ATONEMENT AND REDEMPTION

It has already been noted in preceding pages that the Divine mercy is to be defined as God's compassionate pity toward the miserable estate into which man fell because of sin. This mercy provided atonement for the sin which cast man into just this miserable estate.

It has also been noted that in order to atonement and redemption, there had to be the Covenant of Redemption between the Trinitarian Persons, Father and Son. In this transaction within the Trinity, God the Father commissions His Only Begotten Son to make possible the redemption of men through satisfying the demands of the Divine justice, and the Only Begotten Son accepts this commission voluntarily. Upon this transaction within the Trinity, all else in atonement and redemption depends.

1. Atonement and the Divine Wrath

It is the execution in history of the atonement and redemption which is the concern of this chapter. The manner in which Shedd presented this is the manner of Anselm, whom Shedd believed to have been the foremost interpreter of the atonement. Shedd was attracted to Anselm quite understandably, because:

> Everything is referred to a metaphysical or necessary ground, and hence we have in this theory the first metaphysic of the Christian doctrine of Atonement. . . . Anselm is the first instance in which the theologian plants himself upon the position of philosophy and challenges for the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction, both a rational necessity, and a scientific rationality. . . . Cur Deus Homo exhibits a depth, breadth, and rigour of thinking that is not surpassed by any production of the same extent in theological liberature . . . and . . . the view of the atonement here exhibited is thoroughly Biblical, and thoroughly Protestant.[1]

It was the Anselmic position that the atonement is absolutely, or metaphysically, necessary in order to the remission of sin, and that only God-incarnate could make the atonement. This is the same position held by Shedd and presented fully in both Theological Essays, and in Dogmatic Theology. In its briefest compass, the atonement as viewed by Shedd is presented as follows:

---

1. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, II, 275, 283.

In the voluntary, the cordially offered sacrifice of the incarnate Son, the judicial nature of God, which by constitutional necessity requires the punishment of sin, finds its righteous requirement fully met. Plenary punishment is inflicted upon One who is infinite, and therefore competent; upon One who is finite, and therefore passible; upon One who is innocent, and therefore can suffer for others; upon One who is voluntary, and therefore uncompelled. By this theanthropic oblation the ethical feeling, the organic emotion of displeasure in the Deity is, in the Scripture phrase, made "propitious" towards the guilty because it has been placated by it. Thus God is immutably just while He justifies, and his mercy is, in the last analysis, one with his truth and his law.[2]

Concerning this atoning work of Christ on the cross, there are two important points which should be made and explained. First, the atonement is wholly a work of God, or, as Shedd said, "a work within God." Second, the essence of the atonement lies in the suffering. Each of these matters is in need of clarification if Shedd's position is to be understood.

The atonement which is manifested historically in the death of Jesus Christ on the cross is to be understood as "a sovereign act of God,"[3] an act of which God is "the cause and the end."[4] In the atonement, everything comes from within God.[5] God does all that is done.[6] All of these statements

---

2. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 293. The whole of Essay Five, "The Atonement a Satisfaction of the Moral Nature of God and Man" is Shedd's definitive work on this subject.

3. Ibid., p. 314. 4. Ibid., p. 260.

5. Ibid., p. 272.

6. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, pp. 117-118.

are illustrated in one quotation from Shedd's initial essay upon the atonement, reading:

The propitiation is wholly "ab intra," a self-oblation upon the part of Deity itself, by which to satisfy those immanent and eternal imperatives of the Divine Nature which without it must find their satisfaction in the punishment of the transgressor, or else be outraged. . . . God is inherently inclined to forgive; and there is no proof so strong as the fact that He does not shrink from this amazing self-sacrifice which forgiveness necessitates. The desire to save His transgressing and guilty creature wells up and overflows from the depths of His own compassionate heart, and needs no soliciting nor prompting from without. Side by side in the God-head, then, there dwell the impulse to punish and the desire to pardon; but the desire to pardon is realized in act, by carrying out the impulse to punish, not indeed upon the person of the criminal, but upon that of his substitute. And the substitute is the Punisher Himself.[7]

Thus the atonement is God's great self-satisfying activity, undertaken in order that there shall not be in the Divine Nature any conflict between the Divine wrath and the Divine good-will which desires a basis for extending to men that forgiveness and irresistible regenerating grace which alone can rescue them from their miserable estate.[8]

The essence of the atonement is in the suffering.[9] The suffering is evidence of penalty inflicted. Throughout the Old Testament, said Shedd, the atonement is connected with

---

7. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 272-273.

8. Ibid., p. 269.

9. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 390.

[illegible] illustrated [illegible] one quotation [illegible]
[illegible], reading:

> [illegible] is wholly "ad libitum," a self-[illegible] [illegible] itself, by which [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] their satisfaction in [illegible] [illegible], or else to nature. . . . [illegible] [illegible]; and there is no proof [illegible] [illegible] not suffice [illegible] [illegible] necessitated. The desire to save his [illegible] and guilty [illegible] [illegible] of his own compassionate [illegible] prompting from without. [illegible] [illegible], there dwell [illegible] [illegible] but the desire to punish [illegible] [illegible] original, but upon [illegible] is the punisher himself.[7]

[illegible] is God's great self-satisfaction [illegible], [illegible] in order that there shall not be [illegible] [illegible] any conflict between the divine [illegible] will which desires a [illegible] [illegible] and irresistible regenerating grace which alone [illegible] from their miserable estate.[8]

The virtue of the atonement is in the suffering.[9] [illegible] suffering is evidence of penalty inflicted. [illegible] Testament, said Shedd, the atonement is connected with

7. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, [illegible]

8. Ibid., p. [illegible]

9. [illegible] Theology, [illegible]

the agony and death of the victim. But, in the atonement for the sins of the world, agony and death are not enough. It must be an agony and death which involves suffering of both quality and quantity sufficient to satisfy the penalty for which the punishment is inflicted. Shedd made it clear that the suffering of Jesus Christ on the cross was sufficient both in quality and quantity. The most revealing sentence in this regard was this one: "The sufferings of Christ the mediator were vicariously penal, or atoning, because the intention, both on the part of the Father and the Son, was that they should satisfy justice for the sin of man."[10] Again, the emphasis was placed upon the Covenant of Redemption.

To sum up: the atonement of Christ was an act of God's mercy to appease God's wrath and satisfy the demands of God's justice. This act of God had its principal effect upon God. According to Shedd, the chief effect of the atonement must always be looked for "within the Divine Nature."[11]

2. Obedience and Divine Justice

Although the expiatory work of God in Christ's death upon the cross is sufficient to appease God's wrath and make

---

10. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 424.

11. Ibid., II, 399.

possible remission of sins, it is not enough to satisfy the demands of God's justice and make possible man's redemption. Therefore, whereas the suffering and death of Christ earned for man remission of sins, the obedient life of Christ earned for man the blessings of salvation and the rewards of heaven.[12] The Mediator obeyed the law for man, "in heart and conduct, without a single slip or failure."[13] Thus he could offer up to God, on man's behalf, not only a sinless sacrifice, but also perfect obedience. As the sacrifice made possible the reconciliation of the Divine mercy and the Divine wrath, the obedience made possible the satisfaction of the demands of Divine justice, since through the imputation of Christ's active obedience to each regenerate soul, God can then justly reward that soul with eternal life!

Shedd believed that this emphasis upon Christ's perfect obedience was important. He believed it to be the contribution of the Reformers to Christian doctrine. He labeled it the "only advance" which Protestant thought concerning soteriology had made beyond the thought of Anselm. He buttressed this claim with quotations from the Reformers concerning Christ's obedience and imputed righteousness, and supplemented these with further quotations from Paley and Edwards. Then he

---

12. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 432, 530.

13. Ibid., II, 432.

summed up the matter in these words:

There is the very same need of Christ's obeying the law in our stead in order to the reward, as of his suffering the penalty in our stead in order to our escaping the penalty; and the same reason why one should be accepted on our account as the other. One was as requisite to answer the law's demands as the other.[14]

Thus it is that the redeeming work of Christ, both in the atonement and in obedience, is to be understood, according to Shedd, with regard to the strictness of Divine justice. It is a matter of Divine activity designed to satisfy both the Divine wrath and the Divine justice in order that the Divine good-will might be unimpeded in its expression.

3. Atonement and Man

In his work, Dogmatic Theology, while still on the subject of the vicarious atonement, Shedd wrote: "It is in place here to notice its relation to the soul of man. For, while Christ's atonement has primarily this objective relation to the Divine nature, it has also a secondary subjective relation to the nature of the guilty creature for whom it is made."[15] Of course, it is to be remembered that this rela-

---

14. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 417. See also, II, 433.

15. Ibid., II, 409.

tionship which the atonement has to man is limited to the elect, those who through regeneration are given the faith to appreciate and appropriate the atonement and the redemption.

The first influence which the vicarious atonement of Christ has upon man is that it pacifies the human conscience. The atonement has the same type of effect upon the moral nature of man as it has upon the moral nature of God.[16] However, there is nothing independent about this. It is only when the human conscience knows that the Divine moral nature has been pacified, that it can be pacified. Here, as elsewhere, "The human conscience is the mirror and index of the Divine attribute of justice."[17]

In his Commentary on Romans, Shedd suggested that it is the function of the Cross to reveal to man just that manner in which the Divine moral nature is pacified. He said:

> Christ is set forth a propitiatory sacrifice principally for the sake of disclosing how God can be strictly just, and at the same time justify the unjust. . . . That a judge can be just, and at the same time not inflict punishment where it is due, is in itself self-contradictory. This contradiction is removed by vicarious atonement, or the infliction of penalty upon a substitute.[18]

All of this is but a repetition of that which Shedd had

---

16. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 409-410.

17. Ibid., II, 409.

18. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, pp. 84-85.

insisted upon when he wrote his early essay, "The Atonement a Satisfaction of the Moral Nature of God and Man." In this essay, together with portions of his volume, Sermons to the Natural Man, Shedd went into considerable detail to show the pains of conscience that attend man's certain knowledge that sin means condemnation and that condemnation means penalty. Thus, wrote Shedd, wherever conscience has been allowed to do its proper work, the sinner is ready to hear the good news that his crime has incurred penalty through the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ.[19] Once this is believed, the human conscience is pacified. This is the first work of the atonement upon man.

The second influence of the vicarious atonement of Christ upon man is that it moves the human spirit to trust the Divine Author of this merciful act. The believing man welcomes the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ with joy, gratitude, and trust.[20]

However, since the appropriation of the benefits of the atonement, and the enjoyment of these subjective relationships of the atonement, are dependent upon God's electing and regenerating grace, the discussion must turn to that, in order

---

19. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 409-410. Cf. Sermons to the Natural Man, pp. 147-149.

20. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 412-413.

to make more clear just how it happens that the benefits made possible in the atonement are made effective in the lives of men.

4. Regeneration

Whereas it is the activity of the Second Person of the Trinity which effected the atonement and reconciled the mercy and wrath of God the Father, it is the activity of the Third Person of the Trinity which applies the benefits of the atonement and thereby effects the work of redemption. Regeneration is the instantaneous action of the Holy Spirit upon the human spirit, whereby the spirit that was dead in trespasses and sin receives spiritual life and becomes a new person.[21] As the atonement was solely a work of God, so too is regeneration.[22] What is more, just as the first inclination to sin was unconscious, so regeneration is a work of God in the human soul that is below consciousness.[23] Which, of course, means that man is a recipient, man is passive in regeneration.[24]

---

21. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 506.

22. Ibid., II, 498

23. Ibid., II, 505.

24. Ibid., II, 502.

All of this is as it must be. It is but the working out of the decree of predestination and election to eternal life. It rests solely upon the determination of God. God alone is responsible for it. To be sure, there is that which is designated as "cooperation with common grace" which, though it in no way obligates God to use regenerating grace, nevertheless is such that both the sinner and the preacher of the Word can rely upon its being followed by the bestowal of regenerating grace.[25] In the Calvinistic system this meant that it commonly followed that to as many as read and heard the Divine Word, seriously sought to understand its truth, prayed for the Holy Spirit to convict them of sin and regenerate them to life eternal, and confessed their own absolute helplessness as concerns salvation--to these, regenerating grace was given.[26] These are the "prepared" to whom the gift of the Spirit and His regeneration is given.

Regeneration, with respect to the human will, is the restoration of the power of a new self-determination, which power was lost in the Fall. Not only is this power of self-determination restored, but an inclination to holiness is given with it. Thus the proper word for regeneration as it applies to the human will is "renewal."[27]

---

25. Shedd, <u>Dogmatic Theology</u>, II, 512-525.

26. <u>Ibid</u>., II, 525. 27. <u>Ibid</u>., II, 498-499.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]. It rests mainly upon the [illegible] of God, [illegible]

[illegible] is regeneration [illegible].

[illegible] designated as "cooperation with common grace" which,

[illegible] it is no way [illegible] to the regenerating grace.

[illegible] is such that [illegible]

[illegible] the word and rely upon [illegible]

[illegible] regenerating grace.[25] In the [illegible]

[illegible] that it commonly [illegible]

[illegible] the divine word, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible], confessed their own [illegible]-

[illegible] as [illegible]

[illegible] given.[26] [illegible] the "prepared" to [illegible]

[illegible] the Spirit and his Regeneration [illegible].

Regeneration, with respect to the human will, is the [illegible] of the power of a new [illegible] in the will. [illegible] restored, [illegible] it. Thus the proper word for regeneration [illegible] the human will is "[illegible]."[27]

---

25. [illegible]
26. Ibid., II, 525. 27. Ibid., [illegible].

Regeneration, with respect to the human understanding, "enlightens the mind." By this action, the human understanding comes to an immediate consciousness of truth, thereby becoming certain of that which should be done.[28]

In this two-fold manner, regeneration is the preparatory ground and cause of conversion.

5. Conversion

Conversion is that action of man which results from regeneration.[29] This action of man consists of two parts: faith and repentance.[30] These two parts of the action of conversion are designated by Shedd to be "the sole activity of man."[31] The God who has renewed the will does not participate in the repenting action of that renewed will. The God who has enlightened the mind, does not participate in the believing action of that mind. Man is the sole actor in conversion.[32]

Right at this point where the distinction between regeneration and conversion as acts of God and man respectively is so sharply drawn, it should be noted that in Shedd's

---

28. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 495-496.

29. Ibid., II, 529.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., II, 494.

treatment there was a lack of "carry-over" from one to the other. In his presentation of regeneration, Shedd left the human will poised, as it were, on the point of a definite self-determination to God. This action is what could be expected of the man upon whose spirit the Holy Spirit of God had acted directly to "renew" his will. But there was no discussion of this "definite self-determination to God" and its consequences in the portion of Shedd's presentation entitled "Conversion." In fact, it was almost left out completely as he began a discussion of faith and justification and repentance and sanctification. He worked with these four terms in a manner which in no way related them to his earlier discussion of the nature of the human will and its determination. Logically, it seems that this new determination of the will to holiness should restore man to his original creation. But this is not so. The inclination of the will to holiness is not as strong as the previous inclination of the will to sin had been. The self-inclination of man's will to sin resulted in total depravity. The self-inclination of man's will to holiness, following upon God's regenerating activity, does not result in anything resembling total holiness or sanctification. Recognition of this fact caused Shedd to write in his <u>Commentary on Romans</u>:

> There is consequently a "slavery to righteousness," as well as a "slavery to sin." . . . This minor element of difference between the "slavery to sin," and the "slavery to righteous-

ness," arises from a difference between the effects of apostasy, and the effects of regeneration. The apostasy of the human will resulted immediately and instantaneously in total depravity: viz., a sinful inclination, with no remainders of the previous holy inclination. But the regeneration of the will does not result immediately and instantaneously in total sanctification: viz., a holy inclination with no remainders of the previous sinful inclination.[33]

Shedd knew the problem. But he made no attempt to explain why such a thing should be. And, to call this a "minor element of difference" is, to say the least, an understatement.

Shedd knew that in the regenerate man, because of indwelling sin, there was the continual incurrence of guilt and the continuing manifestation of evidences of the corruption related to sin.[34] Concerning the matter of guilt, it was not difficult to suggest a solution. Faith was the answer. Faith in the atoning death of Jesus Christ, said Shedd, cleanses from guilt, and faith is produced in man when God in His mercy elects him to saving faith.[35] Faith is one of the acts of conversion which follows upon regeneration. Faith is a continuing turning to Christ as the ground of justification.[36] Faith is the way of appropriating the justification afforded by the atonement and obedience of Jesus

---

33. Shedd, Commentary on Romans, pp. 166-167.

34. Ibid., pp. 207, 208.

35. Ibid., p. 271. Cf. Dogmatic Theology, II, 529.

36. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 544-545.

Christ. And, so long as faith continues, God is continually forgiving the believer's sins and imputing unto him the righteousness of Christ. That is why, through faith, the regenerate man can live without the pressure of the guilt which results from unforgiven sin. That is also why, through faith, the regenerate man can live with the confidence of eternal life.

At this point it should be noted that Shedd understood faith in such a manner that the greatest emphasis fell upon God. Man was fundamentally the receiver in the relationship. God's gift of forgiveness and God's imputation of Christ's righteousness were the chief things involved in Shedd's discussion of faith. This perhaps accounts for the fact that his discussion of faith was not so brief as the discussion of repentance which followed.

Repentance, as defined by Shedd, means: turning to God as the chief end of existence, and away from the creature as the chief end.[37] This, as before suggested, would seem to mean restoration of the intended relationship between man and God. However, Shedd did not give much place to this important idea. He did conclude his discussion of justification by noting that it was not an end in itself, and by saying: "Pardon is in order to future resistance and victory over

---

37. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 529.

[illegible]. [illegible], so [illegible], as [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] implying the believer's [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] of Christ. [illegible] is why, [illegible], [illegible] can live [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] results from [illegible]. [illegible] in [illegible], through [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] life.

At this point it should be [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] receive [illegible] not [illegible] [illegible] gift of [illegible] and [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] involved in [illegible] [illegible] of faith. This [illegible] [illegible] for the fact [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of faith was not so [illegible] as the discussion [illegible] which followed.

[illegible], as defined by [illegible], [illegible] end of [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible] end.[37] This, as before [illegible], [illegible]

[illegible], however, [illegible] did not give much place to this [illegible]. He did conclude his discussion of justification by [illegible] that it was not an end in itself, [illegible] in order to [illegible] [illegible] and victory over

37. [illegible], [illegible], [illegible].

sin."[38] This sounds somewhat like the Westminster Confession statement regarding repentance, reading, in part: ". . . to turn . . . unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with Him in all the ways of His commandments."[39] Yet Shedd gave but two pages to his discussion of repentance in his work, Dogmatic Theology.[40]

This suggests that when Shedd made a sharply defined division between regeneration and conversion, and made the one to be solely God's work and the other to be solely man's work, he left himself the task of describing a positive "work of man" under the heading of "repentance." This task was something for which he was quite unprepared. He had previously done so much to describe man's inability, both because of sin and because of man's finitude. Thus it worked out to be quite typical of Shedd's total perspective and emphasis when he managed to write only two pages as his discussion of the subject of repentance.

Under the heading of "sanctification," Shedd repeated the words of the Westminster Shorter Catechism: "Sanctification is the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled

---

38. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 551.

39. Westminster Confession of Faith, XV, ii.

40. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 535-536.

more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness."[41] But he did not declare sanctification to be the exclusive work of the Holy Spirit. Sanctification, he said, results from the continuation of the agency of the Holy Spirit after the act of regeneration, and from the cooperation of the believer with the Holy Spirit in the use of the means of sanctification.[42] Sanctification, therefore, is a cooperative work of God and man. Thus, sanctification is both a grace, and a duty![43] Shedd stated specifically that "It is the duty of the Christian man to cultivate the new nature and develop the new principle of holiness."[44] He suggested that the manner of doing this was by "exercising, at every occasion, the graces of the new man."[45] In sanctification, the Spirit could be counted upon to excite the regenerate "to . . . reading and hearing of the word, confession of sin, partaking of the Lord's Supper, prayer, struggle against sin, and wise response to all providences, afflictions, and

---

41. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 553, quoting from the answer to Question 35, Westminster Shorter Catechism.

42. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 554-555.

43. Ibid., II, 555.

44. Shedd, Sermons to the Natural Man, p. 312.

45. Ibid., p. 312.

chastizements."[46] It was the duty of the regenerate to co-operate with the Divine Spirit by following the direction of this excitement and putting to use all these means of sanctification. On the basis of this "duty of sanctification" and this "duty of using the means of sanctification," Shedd wrote his volume of Sermons to the Spiritual Man, designed "to aid the believer in his struggle against and victory over indwelling sin."[47] Throughout this whole treatment of sanctification, Shedd gave evidence that he believed that striving after effective cooperation with the Holy Spirit in sanctification, though a duty, was nevertheless, a distinguishing mark of the regenerate. On one occasion he put this bluntly, saying: "[a mark of regeneration is] a weariness of sin, a growing desire to be delivered from it; and a purer, simpler, hungering after holiness."[48]

Holiness, according to Shedd, will not be achieved in this life. The "struggle against and victory over indwelling sin," does not come to fruition in this life. Sanctification is gradual, and fluctuatingly progressive at best, in this life.[49] But, sanctification is certain to be completed

---

46. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 554. See also, III, 452.

47. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, Preface.

48. Ibid., pp. 309-310.

49. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 555.

[illegible] in his struggle against sin. Victory over [illegible]. Throughout the whole treatment of sanc-[illegible] gave evidence that he believed that [illegible] active cooperation with the Holy Spirit in sanctification, though a duty, was nevertheless, a distin-[illegible]. "[it marks of regeneration is] a watchful [illegible] a strong desire to be delivered from it; and a prayer, after holiness."

[illegible], according to him, will not be achieved in [illegible] does not come to [illegible] in this life. [illegible] But, sanctification is certain to be complete [illegible]

[illegible]

at death. Concerning the regenerate man, Shedd wrote:

> If at the new birth of his soul, God the Holy Spirit, regenerated him by an instantaneous efficiency that was supernatural, so at death the remaining corruption which the race and fight have not succeeded in purging away, shall be removed by a corresponding decisive energy on the part of the Great Sanctifier.[50]

Following death and complete sanctification, the regenerate man, then a disembodied spirit, enters into that blessed intermediate state which God has prepared for His Own.[51] In this intermediate state, the sanctified regenerate await the resurrection of the body and the final judgment. This final judgment will not affect the estate of the sanctified regenerate who have already, at death, entered into blessedness. However, this final judgment will make public the character and conduct of all, so that the grounds of judgment passed may be clearly known by all.[52] Then, having been re-united with its resurrected body, the sanctified regenerate spirit, enters into heaven as a member of the kingdom of souls which God the Father promised the Son as a reward for the work of atonement and redemption. Then the work of atonement and redemption is complete.

---

50. Shedd, Sermons to the Spiritual Man, p. 320.

51. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, 592, 616.

52. Ibid., II, 660-662.

[illegible]ilation. [illegible]

[illegible] the new birth of his soul, [illegible] by an intermediate [illegible]

[illegible]

Following death [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] man, then a disembodied spirit, [illegible]

[illegible] state which [illegible]

[illegible] intermediate state, the [illegible]

[illegible] of the body and the final judgment. [illegible]

[illegible] will not affect the [illegible]

[illegible] have already, [illegible]

[illegible], this final judgment will [illegible]

[illegible] of all, so that the [illegible]

[illegible] already known by all. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] then heaven is a [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] it [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Chapter VII

THE NATURE OF HISTORY: SECULAR AND SACRED

1. The General Idea of History

Shedd developed his views of history in the winter of 1853 and 1854 in a series of lectures which served as an introduction to courses in the department of church history. These lectures were later published under the title, Lectures upon the Philosophy of History.[1]

As a necessary prolegomena for the study of history, Shedd elaborated his views concerning the nature of history. "History," he wrote, "is, in its abstract and essential nature, development."[2] The basis for the whole process which

---

1. Shedd, Lectures upon the Philosophy of History (Boston, 1861). Hereinafter cited as Lectures.

2. Ibid., p. 10.

makes up history was laid, in the beginning, "by a fiat, supernatural and creative."[3] Therefore, history "merely expands a varied latency that was originated when the morning stars sang together."[4]

A fuller statement of these views is to be found in his later work, History of Christian Doctrine. In this work, Shedd wrote:

> Whatever has been constitutionally inlaid in matter or in mind, by the Creator of both, is destined by Him, and under His own superintendence, to be evolved; and of all such germinal substance, be it in the sphere of Nature or of Man, we may say that not a particle of it will be annihilated; it will pass through the predetermined states of an expanding process, and obtain a full development. And thus its development is its history.[5]

In the first portion of his Lectures upon the Philosophy of History, Shedd explained and adopted this philosophic understanding of the nature of history and of the idea of development. After having suggested that a study of the general subject of genetic development would reveal it to be, intrinsically, one of the most difficult subjects to discuss in the whole philosophical catalogue, Shedd wrote: ". . . we desire . . . to recommend . . . the theory of genetic development as

---

3. Shedd, Lectures, p. 16.

4. Ibid., p. 34.

5. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, I, 10.

one which has most affinity with the real nature of History, and which, consequently, is the best organon or instrument for its investigation."[6]

Shedd recognized this approach to history to be a contribution made by his century. He recognized it to be part of the naturalistic manner of viewing things, a manner of viewing things which had already begun to influence many other disciplines besides natural science. As a result of adopting this point of view, Shedd said that the historians had come to--

> connect events, phenomena, prominent individuals themselves, together with the ages and great tendencies which they represented, with the great standing truths of reason and revelation, and the plans and purposes of that Supreme Being Who is Author and Revealer of all. . . . This step was taken when the historian began to conceive and construct the facts of history on the method of genetic development. . . . This necessarily compelled him to go beyond not merely the external events themselves, but also their connection with leading individuals, down to the first springs of history in the plans and purposes of God, and in Church History especially, to the truths and doctrines which God had revealed in His written word, as the germ and measure of all true development.[7]

These sentences were written in the winter of 1853-1854, just five years before Darwin published his <u>Origin of Species</u>. Thus, it is essential that in reading them, we do not read

---

6. Shedd, <u>Lectures</u>, p. 41.

7. <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 45-46.

into them any ideas which followed upon the publication of Darwin's work.

Shedd was very careful to make qualifying statements concerning the idea of development which he had espoused. The three main qualifications of the idea of genetic development were:

1. Inasmuch as it is universal and abstract, it does not, of itself, determine the character and value of the process. It simply indicates that it is an evolution from a potential basis . . . and hence . . . is applicable, indifferently, to a latency that is good, or to a latency that is evil, to a germ originated by the Creator, or to a germ originated by the creature.[8]

2. There is nothing in the logical conception of an evolving process that warrants the assertion that all movements in the history of a moral agent must, of necessity, be normal and upward.[9]

3. The moral power of self-determination causes alterations and catastrophes, within the moral world, such as never appear in the world of material nature, and hence, when the theorist comes into this sphere, he must not be surprised if he finds archetypes departed from, and glorious ideals unrealized.[10]

Unless these qualifications are appreciated, the manner in which Shedd used the words "evolution" and "development" will be misleading, since his use of these words was not like the use to which other writers put them. For Shedd, the important thing was not the genetic development itself, but

---

8. Shedd, Lectures, p. 103.

9. Ibid., p. 57.

10. Ibid., p. 66.

rather, the character of the initial inlaid kernel or imbedded germ of which the development was but the unfolding. This "inlaid kernel" or "germ" is what is definitive for the development, for from this inlaid kernel, or germ, comes the direction and goal of the development. Fundamentally, therefore, by genetic development, Shedd simply meant the necessary, natural, and organic connection of all the parts which make up the expansion of the inlaid kernel, which is its history.[11] If that is kept in mind, Shedd's interpretation of history as development will be more understandable.

2. The Nature of Secular History

For Shedd, the secular history of the world embodies "only workings of the human mind and such products as are confessedly within its competence to originate."[12] Secular history is "the account of the natural and spontaneous development of human nature as left to itself, guided only by the dictates of finite reason and impelled by the determination of the free, but fallen human will."[13]

---

11. Shedd, Lectures, pp. 14-20.

12. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 89.

13. Ibid., p. 87.

It is on the basis of this that it is the sphere of secular history where evolution means corruption and decline. Man's failure to obey the law of his creation resulted in the crowding out of the original germ implanted by the Creator, and by the Creator's permission, the germ of man's self-willed sin took its place. The development of this germ is in the direction of decline, decay, and ruin. Sin, which is man's creation, became, from the moment of its origination in the Garden of Eden, the "germ originated by the creature" out of which all secular history evolves.[14] Therefore--

> The ordinary and common history of mankind, as the observer in every age sees it going on before his eyes, differs from all other histories of which he knows anything, by being contrary to the primary law of creation. . . . Man, then, stands alone; the only unloyal race in the universe; the only species of being which, as a unity and as a whole, has thrown itself out of the line of its true destination, and is running a false career.[15]

Mankind's "false career" is development downward. The natural and spontaneous development of fallen human nature, left to itself, is downward, away from its true destination. This is what Shedd had described as "sin's own awful and isolated development, its own awful and isolated history."[16]

---

14. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 160-168.

15. Shedd, Lectures, pp. 60, 62.

16. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 88.

In spite of the fact that Shedd marshalled facts to give evidence of the downward nature of secular history, it must be noted that his idea of secular history is of a piece with his idea of the condition of fallen man, Secular history, for Shedd, is but the story of the sinful inclination of the will of fallen man writ large. And it was presented that way for a purpose. That purpose was to "subpoena History," as it were, as a witness to man's need for supernatural regeneration. This was made clear by the words which came at the conclusion of Shedd's chapter on secular history:

> A rigorous application of the doctrine of development compels us to the further position that the reversal of this illegitimate, and false, process which is going on in humanity, also necessitates a creative power. For no process of mere, and strict, evolution can go behind itself, and alter the base from which it proceeds. . . . No new order of history can possibly begin, if the existing movement and expansion are simply left to themselves. An absolutely originant and creative power must be called in, to reverse the process, and give it an upward, instead of a downward, direction.[17]

Secular history is that genetic development of human life which is restrained in its downward plunge by God, but which is completely devoid of, and isolated from, the saving activity of God. Secular history is also witness to humanity's need of such saving activity of God as will reverse the process of history for at least some of mankind. Such was secular history as presented by Shedd.

---

17. Shedd, Lectures, pp. 72-76.

3. The Nature of Sacred History

"Sacred History is the development of man's regenerated nature, under the continued influence of the power that first, and instantaneously effected the change."[18] The very foundation of Church history, according to Shedd, was "the Divine Mind and Divine Power, exerting themselves with an extraordinary and creative energy."[19] Concerning this power, Shedd wrote:

> From the expulsion from Eden down to the close of the miracles in the Apostolic age, a positively miraculous intervention of Divine power lies under the series of events; . . . And, if we pass from external events to that inward change that was constantly brought about in human character . . . ; if we pass from the miraculous to the simply spiritual manifestation of the Divine agency as it is seen in the inward life of the church, we find that we are in a far higher sphere than that of secular history. There is now a positive intercommunication between the human and the Divine mind, and the development which results constitutes a history far profounder, far purer, and holier, far more encouraging and glorious, than that of the natural man and the secular world.[20]

In the sphere of Church history, and there alone, it can be said that "God is in history."

> God is in sacred history by an inward efficiency, the supernatural agency of His spirit. . . . He is its inspiring life, and actuating energy. . . . Only where He works "to will and

---

18. Shedd, Lectures, p. 79.

19. Ibid., p. 82.

20. Ibid., pp. 88-89.

to do of His good pleasure" can it be said that God is in the process of history.[21]

As Shedd began to describe this God-directed development in the history of the Church, he made this confident claim for the result:

The Doctrine of evolution is now to be applied to that gradual process of recovery from the apostasy of his will, which regenerated man is passing through, here on earth, as a member of the spiritual kingdom of Christ. We shall find this to be a series and sequence, as organic as any that have passed before our review, or that we can conceive of.[22]

This high claim, however, was soon hedged around with qualifying words. The development he unfolded was described as "only imperfectly normal," "asymmetrical," "lacking entire harmony," and "displaying in places a development that has been intermitted for a great length of time." The reason which he gave for these qualifying phrases is as follows:

Church History, as we actually find it, exhibits a complex appearance, a double movement. It is both the expansion of a true, and the destruction of a false, evolution. As, in the instance of the individual Christian, the career consists of a double activity, the living unto righteousness and dying unto sin, so in the instance of the Church, the entire history consists of the growth of the spiritual and holy, and the resistance of the natural and sinful.[23]

---

21. Shedd, History of Doctrine, I, 25.

22. Shedd, Lectures, p. 77.

23. Ibid., p. 84.

After a closer examination of the failure of the history of the Church to display that normal, harmonius, symmetrical development which might have been expected of a process having the Divine mind and power as its foundation, the matter was put bluntly: "The religious life is enfeebled and diminished by the carnal and the secular, in both the individual and the church."[24]

Shedd substantiated this latter judgment as he described historic occasions where the enfeeblement of the Church displayed itself. He described the tragedy of the intermitted development of the Eastern Church. He described the Church of Northern Africa, once quite vigorous, but soon in such condition that "the whole population fell an easy prey to the fanatic zeal of the Mohammedan." And, after these descriptions, and others like them, he said: "The external development of Christianity is constantly liable to interruption in parts and sections of the entire career."[25]

If attention is turned to the internal development of Christianity, to the development of its doctrines, creeds, and symbols, the picture, according to Shedd, is much brighter. Here, in the internal development of Christianity, will be found that "gradual unfolding of truth implanted in the

---

24. Shedd, Lectures, p. 95.

25. Ibid., p. 95.

[illegible] examination [illegible]
[illegible] the famous [illegible] in Egypt, [illegible]
[illegible] which might have been [illegible]
[illegible] the divine mind and power [illegible]
[illegible]: "The [illegible]
[illegible] by the [illegible] and the [illegible]
[illegible]."[1]

[illegible] this latter [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible]. He described the [illegible]
[illegible] of the [illegible]
[illegible], [illegible]
[illegible] "the whole population fell an easy prey [illegible]
[illegible] of the [illegible]." [illegible]
[illegible], and others like them, he said: "The [illegible]
[illegible] by [illegible]
[illegible] in [illegible] of the [illegible]."[2]

[illegible] is turned to the [illegible]
[illegible], to the development of [illegible],
[illegible], [illegible]
[illegible], in the internal development of Christianity. [illegible]
[illegible] "[illegible]

1. [illegible], p. [illegible]
2. Ibid., p. 72.

Scriptures." Here, in the internal development of Christianity, Shedd declared:

We shall find that the real mind of the Spirit, the real teaching of Scriptures, comes out plainer and clearer in the general growth and development of the Christian mind. Indeed, we may regard Church history, so far as it is mental and inward in its nature; so far as it is the record of a mental inquiry into the nature of Christianity and the contents of the Bible; as being as near to the infallibility of the written revelation, as anything that is still imperfect and fallible can be.[26]

It was the work of his two-volume History of Christian Doctrine to give substance to this claim. In this work Shedd proceeded to trace the development of tendencies and doctrines in the Church. He had little difficulty showing the gradual development of the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ. It was more difficult to find a gradual course of development of the doctrine of man, and the doctrine of atonement. As an example of this difficulty, the statements which were made concerning Anselm are instructive, and seem to qualify considerably the idea that the internal development of Church history was more symmetrical than the external. Concerning Anselm, Shedd wrote:

Had the anthropology of the Medieval Church been shaped by the profound contemplations of Anselm, instead of the superficial speculations of Lombard, the history of the Western

---

26. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 91-92.

Church would have been that of a gradual purification and progress, instead of a gradual corruption and decline.[27]

This same kind of thing was repeated when Shedd dealt with Anselm and soteriology. Here, however, Shedd commented upon the nature of the development. He said:

It is remarkable that the bursting forth of a new spirit of inquiry, the dawning of a new era after five hundred years of stagnation and darkness, should have commenced with the sudden appearance of a mind of such remarkable depth, clearness, and living piety as that of Anselm. We do not find the usual antecedents and gradual preparation for the advent of such a spirit. The sun rises without a dawn or a morning twilight. In the very opening of a new era which followed close upon a period of great superstition and misapprehension of the true nature of sin and atonement, we find a view of the work of Christ decidedly in advance of the best soteriology of the Patristic age, and agreeing, substantially, with that of the Reformation . . . . God, undoubtedly, in this, as in all other instances in which he does not employ a miraculous agency, conducted the process upon the ordinary principles of His administration, and made it a continuity, though marked by sudden and striking changes.[28]

Shedd's remarks about Anselm substantiate his point of view concerning the irrationality of sin and the unpredictability of grace, but, at the same time, serve to undermine his insistence upon an organic development of the internal life of the Church which is comparable to the organic development found in the realm of nature. Which means that when examined closely, the symmetry of the internal development of

---

27. Shedd, History of Doctrine, II, 139.

28. Ibid., II, 273-274.

Christianity is not unlike that of the external development of Christianity. It suggests also, that the internal and external development of the life of the Church cannot be separated in the living stream of Church history as they were separated in the thought and writing of Shedd. Therefore, on the basis of his own descriptions, the development of the Church, whether internal or external, must be put down as asymmetrical and marked by interruption in the process of development.

Shedd's descriptions of past disruptions, stagnations, and intermittencies in the development of the Church did not cause him to lose heart or faith in the progress of the Christian religion. In the face of the disruptions, stagnations, and intermittencies which he both knew and described, Shedd still could say:

Though the process is hindered, turned aside, and temporarily stopped, by the corrupt free agency of man, it is yet as a whole under the guidance and protection of God, and therefore goes on; if not in this nation and age, yet in another. We know from the promise of the Author of Christianity that His religion is destined to a far wider extension among men than has yet been seen; and upon this we must ultimately rest, in order to maintain the confident expectation that such will be the fact.[29]

Resting firmly upon the Divine promise concerning the spread of the Christian religion, Shedd was an optimist

---

29. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 186-187.

personality) is [illegible]

ly. It [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] in the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Gentile's descriptions of [illegible]

has intensities in the development of the Church did not [illegible]

[illegible] him in the heart of [illegible]

[illegible] religion. In the face of the discrepancy, stagn- [illegible]

[illegible] the intensities [illegible]

[illegible] still [illegible] say:

[illegible]

concerning the future. His optimism concerning the Church is shown in the title of one of his sermons: "The Certain Success of Evangelistic Labor." The argument of this sermon is noteworthy:

> We propose to mention some of the reasons that make it certain that the evangelistic labor will succeed; . . . We argue and derive the certainty of the success of evangelistic labor, in the first place, from the nature of Divine truth. . . . Revealed truth is immortal . . . and it can never be expelled from the mind.
>
> . . . .
>
> In the second place, . . . the Scriptures warrant us in asserting that God is more profoundly concerned for the success of that body of truth which He has revealed to mankind in the Scriptures, than He is for the spread and influence of all other ideas and truths whatsoever.
>
> . . . .
>
> A third ground of certainty that evangelistic labor will succeed, is found in the actual instances of success furnished by the annals of such labor.[30]

The sermon concluded with the simple, but "necessary" fact: "Christianity is His religion, and therefore it must ultimately become a universal religion."[31]

In addition to this optimism concerning the work of the Church, Shedd revealed an optimism concerning a particular work which clearly involved both secular and sacred wisdom and power. In May, 1857, he delivered an address before the Massachusetts Colonization Society. The address was entitled,

---

30. Shedd, <u>Sermons to the Spiritual Man</u>, pp. 402-411.

31. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 412.

"Africa and Colonization," and dealt particularly with the Liberian Republic. On the basis of the several reasons which he had given in this address, Shedd declared that he envisaged nothing less than the radical transformation of three hundred thousand African natives, and that transformation in the direction of a Christian continent. "The other continents," he said, "have had their hour of deliverance. The hour of Africa has now, for the first time, come."[32] Such optimism concerning the future may have been matched in the late nineteenth century, but it was rarely exceeded. And, coming from one who knew the power of sin to corrupt, "turn aside, and temporarily halt" the process of development within the Church, this is nothing short of surprising. It was an optimism such as this which showed that with all of his emphasis upon sin, both original and indwelling, Shedd could not escape the general feeling of the time and its optimism. In fact, though too much should never be allowed to rest on a single word, it should be noted in this respect that on one occasion Shedd used a most optimistic term about history as it relates to philosophic thought. There is, he wrote, "little danger of missing the true teachings of human reason, if we collect them from the continuous and self-defecating

---

32. Shedd, "The African Nature," Literary Essays, pp. 248-269.

[illegible]

[illegible] and Civilization," and dealt particularly with the American Republic. On the basis of the several [illegible] which [illegible] given in this address, Shedd declared that he re-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the direction of a Christian [illegible]. "The other [illegible]," he said, "have had their hour of deliverance. The [illegible] now, for the first time, come."[32] [illegible] regarding the future may have been [illegible] in the [illegible], but it was rarely [illegible]. [illegible] from one who knew the power of sin to corrupt, [illegible], and temporarily hold" the process of [illegible], this is nothing short of surprising. It was an [illegible] such as this which showed that with all of his em-[illegible] both original and individuality, [illegible] the general feeling of the time and [illegible]. [illegible], though too much [illegible] never be allowed to [illegible] single word, it should be noted in this respect that on the [illegible] Shedd used a most optimistic tone about history as [illegible] to [illegible] thought. There is, he wrote, "little danger of missing the true tendencies of human [illegible], [illegible] them from the [illegible] and self-deceiving

---

[32] [illegible] "[illegible]," [illegible], [illegible].

development of ages and epochs, . . ."[33] If Shedd actually meant that there was something purifying in history, as history, he was truly more influenced by the common interpretation of development than he knew or admitted. And, for that matter, a careful study of his epistemology will suggest that concerning history's part in the development of the true philosophy and the true system of doctrine Shedd was indeed a very optimistic man. To his ideas concerning doctrine, as they affected his interpretation of history, we now turn.

4. History and Doctrine

It was not without reason that Shedd presented the philosophy of history that he did. The reason lay in his prior commitment to a system of doctrine. His understanding of the history of Christianity was dependent upon his conception of Christianity itself. Shedd, for his own part, recognized that this could be the case, not only of Church historians, but of all students, for he wrote:

> We have only to watch the movements of our minds to find that we carry with us into every field of investigation an

---

33. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 91.

antecedent idea, which gives more or less direction to our studies, and goes far to determine the result to which we come.[34]

There is ample evidence to suggest how Shedd conceived of Christianity. Recall, for example, this quotation from his Inaugural Address as professor of ecclesiastical history in Andover Theological Seminary:

So far, therefore, as a theological system contains historical elements, it is likely to contain Scriptural elements. So far as its statements of doctrine coincide with those of the creeds and symbols in which the wise, the learned, and the holy of all ages have embodied the results of their continuous and self-correcting study of the Scriptures, so far may it be expected to coincide with the substance of inspiration itself.[35]

To this should be added the words which Shedd spoke at the outset of his discourse before the Congregational Library Association in May, 1858, on the subject, "Symbols and Congregationalism":

The ultimate organizing and centralizing influence, therefore, upon which we must place our main reliance as a religious denomination, is the doctrine, the truth of God. This is one and homogeneous, and consequently unifies and harmonizes all that comes under its fair and full influence. But this supposes that eye sees to eye; and that there is a common doctrinal faith, and a common doctrinal creed, for the denomination. Let us, then, consider the necessity that exists in Congregationalism for a stronger symbolical feeling,

---

34. Shedd, <u>Lectures</u>, p. 8.

35. Shedd, <u>Theological Essays</u>, p. 92.

and a bolder confidence in creed-statements, in order to its highest efficiency as a Christian denomination.[36]

The creed-statement and symbol for which Shedd spoke was the Westminster Confession of Faith.

It should be recalled that when Shedd gave the address on "Symbols and Congregationalism" he had recently come from a Presbyterian seminary, to teach in a Congregational seminary. Shedd's first church membership was in the Presbyterian Church. He had begun his ministry in the Congregational Church. In this discourse he had insisted that John Owen, an English Independent, had, together with other Independents, held the theology of the Westminster Assembly. Shedd suggested that they had "of their own free will, and with their own clear eye, followed on in that straight and narrow way of dogma which is the intellectual parallel to the straight and narrow way of life."[37] Shedd dealt in this same way with other founders and fathers of English and New England Congregationalism, insisting that their only quarrel with Presbyterians was in respect to ecclesiastical polity.

The Westminster Assembly, however, did not conceive of its accomplishment in such a divided manner. It was the

---

36. Shedd, Theological Essays, pp. 321-322.

37. Ibid., p. 324. Cf. also p. 352.

opinion of the Assembly that the system of polity, the theory of Church-State relations, and allied matters, were as fully set forth in the written revelation as were matters of doctrine, and that it was their task, and accomplishment, to make clear what the written revelation said on all these matters. They believed that their work was all, doctrine and polity together, the substance of written revelation. They were, on the whole, inclined to agree with Thomas Cartwright when, in 1644, he wrote:

> The discipline of Christ's Church that is necessary for all times is delivered by Christ, and set downe in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, the true and lawfull discipline is to be fetched from thence, and from thence alone. And that which resteth upon any other foundation ought to be esteemed unlawful and counterfeit.[38]

This which Cartwright had declared in his book, A Directory of Church Government, to be the Assembly's task, was swept aside by Shedd when he said:

> The adoption of an exact denominational creed seems to carry with it the renunciation of Congregational freedom, and to pave the way for judicatures, and a central government in the church. But there is no necessary connection between strict doctrine and high-church polity. Each subject stands or falls upon its own merits. . . . What hinders any denomination from being inspired with the spirit of Dort, and Westminster, so far as doctrine is concerned, while yet it cleaves to the most democratic republicanism in polity?[39]

---

38. Hershel Baker, The Wars of Truth (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952), p. 206.

39. Shedd, Theological Essays, p. 352.

In so saying, Shedd aligned himself with a recognizable tendency in Presbyterian circles. It was the tendency to separate the work of the Westminster Assembly on "doctrine" from the work of the Assembly on "polity." Those of this tendency were viewing the doctrine as authoritative, but felt that the polity was from an area wherein an honest difference of opinion could exist. Briggs pointed this out, and documented his thesis, in his book _Whither?_ written on the general subject of the revision of the Westminster Standards.[40]

It should be noted that Shedd did not neglect that portion of the _Westminster Confession of Faith_ which dealt with policy because he preferred to do so. He did so because the events of history had manifested the impossibility of declaring any form of church government to be the result of the development of the historic mind of the Church. Nowhere in Shedd's writing did he indicate that the true Scriptural idea of Church polity had been embodied in the _Westminster Confession of Faith_ and the _Directory of Worship_. In view of his own denominational affiliations, this uncertainty concerning a true Church polity is to be expected. Another relevant fact is that John Owen, the seventeenth-century divine who most influenced Shedd, was an Independent in polity, although his doctrine approximated the doctrine of the

---

40. Briggs, Charles A., _Whither?_ (New York, 1889), pp. 158-178

Westminster Confession of Faith. To these facts, add the historic evidence that whereas the doctrines of the Westminster Assembly found acceptance beyond the circle of Presbyterians, the church polity of the same Assembly had been challenged, or ignored, by all save the Presbyterians from the very time of its promulgation in 1648. All of these things added together make it easier to understand why Shedd developed an appreciation for the Church in the realm of Christian doctrine only.

In the realm of Christian doctrine, and in this realm only could Shedd discover the "mind of the Church" to be clear, in agreement with the Westminster Assembly, and "certain." For that reason he looked upon Church history as fundamentally the development of doctrine. And for that reason, he omitted the social life of the Church. Whatever the cause, it is clear that Shedd did not appreciate the fellowship of believers as an integral part of the redeemed life. His contemporary, Edward Morris of Lane Seminary, noted this in a review of Shedd's Dogmatic Theology. Morris said: "In some respects it is to be regretted that topics of great moment in a complete theological system are only named, or suggested: . . . the Kingship of Christ, the Church; the Kingdom of God on earth . . . ."[41] And Morris was right.

---

41. Edward Morris, "Dr. Shedd's System of Theology," The Presbyterian Review, X (July, 1880), 367.

In the section of his Dogmatic Theology which dealt with soteriology, there was no mention of the Church in the discussion of regeneration, and only brief mention in the discussion of sanctification. In the index to the two-volume Dogmatic Theology, Shedd did not list the word "kingdom," nor is it to be found as a sub-head under God, or Heaven, or Christ. The index is indicative of the facts of the case. Shedd simply did not interpret Church history as the "expanding story of a living fellowship," a fellowship which bears the marks of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. Yet, this point of view was both Calvinistic and early Puritan.

Because he was committed to a system of doctrine, Shedd interpreted the germ and measure of all true development (that is, all true history), to be in the "truths and doctrines which God had revealed in His written word."[42] This is regrettable, for so much of the movement of Christian thought in his time was in the direction of a meaningful ecclesiology.

---

42. Shedd, Lectures, p. 46.

Chapter VIII

CRITICAL REFLECTIONS

1. Against the Current

In retrospect, it is amazing how many of the currents of thought Shedd refused to share in, and how much of the general movement of life about him Shedd opposed. It is helpful, at this point, to attempt a descriptive enumeration of these currents and movements, and of Shedd's contrary position.

In a century when men were placing more and more confidence in the pronouncements of physical scientists, Shedd refused to share this confidence. He declared that science was too occupied with the minutiae of the physical world to sense the world of the spirit, which was the important world. He argued for the point of view that the physical scientists were unable, because of the very nature of their approach, to arrive at truth. He believed that the scientists of that day

were overly ready to give allegiance to theories which had not been proven, and which were, in themselves, a radical departure from that pattern of science which had prevailed prior to the eighteenth century. On the basis of these views concerning physical science, Shedd refused to give credence to the theories of the geologists concerning the age of the earth; he firmly held to the traditional view of "creation-by fiat" as over against the theory of evolution, and he opposed any attempts to encroach upon the world of spirit by positing for matter properties that had hitherto been ascribed to mind. In the stream of contemporary scientific thought, Shedd moved against the current.

In an age when religious leaders, philosophers, and men of literature were proclaiming the immanence of God, the sure and steady progress of the world in which God was immanent, and the importance of nineteenth-century America in the world's development, Shedd held contrary views. He insisted that God could not rightly be said to be "in secular history," and therefore secular history was not making progress, but was deteriorating. It was, he said, only because of God's good providence that the history of the secular world had not become the history of man's self-destruction. Shedd further held that American life could not be counted on to contribute to the good of the world save as American leaders made a serious effort to lead the people to a return to that way of life which characterized the early American Puritans. In the

stream of contemporary philosophical thought, Shedd moved against the current.

At a time when churchmen were welcoming new ideas and new thought patterns into their theological systems, Shedd held out against everything new, and spoke on behalf of that which had been definitively stated in the seventeenth century. Whereas many churchmen were happy to pass on beyond the controversies about "sin: its origin, nature, transmission, and power," controversies which had plagued the previous centuries, Shedd insisted that only a profound view of sin would give theology its necessary foundation. Whereas many churchmen were rejoicing in the manner in which Coleridge had liberated Christianity from Biblical literalism and the fear of Biblical criticism, Shedd announced it to be absolutely necessary for the Christian to hold to the view of verbal inspiration of the whole of the canon of Scripture, and also the traditional views concerning the authorship of the various parts of Scripture. And, though many theologians were rejoicing in the new emphasis upon experience and feeling in matters of religion, Shedd not only criticized this emphasis, but enunciated a system of doctrine which depended upon the rational unfolding of those first principles of the mind which were basic to Plato's philosophy, and upon the delineation of the propositions set down in the written revelation. Whereas many of the influential theologians were giving support to that movement which sought to interpret life and religion on

the basis of insights gained from the life, teaching, and work of Jesus Christ, and were seeking to apply these insights to society, Shedd held both aspects of this movement to be in error. He dismissed Christocentric theology as fragmentary and contrary to the rules of logic, and he held that the Christian social reform movement was a departure from the simple, fundamental themes of sin, guilt, and atonement. In the stream of contemporary religious thought, Shedd moved against the current.

In view of all of this it may seem surprising that Shedd's writings were received at all. Yet his books were widely read, and his influence was considerable. How is this to be accounted for?

2. Champion of Scholastic Faith

Shedd's works were received and his influence was considerable because he provided the conservatives, the Protestant scholastics, the Reformed traditionalists, and the incipient fundamentalists with writings which confirmed and defended a system to which they were already committed. He gave those who agreed with him the feeling that here were competence in Biblical interpretation, wide theological learning, philosophical mastery, respectable scholarship, logic, and literary talent--all at the service of the "faith once delivered to the saints." Thornton Whaling of Southwestern

Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tennessee, expressed a feeling which was no doubt shared by many who accepted Shedd's works and welcomed their appearance. After setting forth the many reasons why Shedd's presentation of the Augustinian-Calvinist system was excellent, Whaling added that Shedd's manner of presentation "gave the force of absolute demonstration to its certain and necessary truth."[1] This was the secret of Shedd's influence and of the popularity of his works. He spoke and wrote with "calm confidence and natural dogmatism,"[2] and provided new authority for old truth. In addition, through his manner of attacking opposing positions, Shedd gave the impression that he had answered them with finality. This is suggested in a meaningful way by a reviewer who declared that Shedd was "eminently successful" in "exposing the errors and inconsistencies of men who, contrary to the requisitions of sound critical science, have often perverted the meaning of the Bible."[3]

For those who already held the views which he promoted and defended, Shedd was a welcome companion in the struggle to maintain the faith of which he was a recognized champion.

---

1. Thornton Whaling, Review of Shedd's Dogmatic Theology, Presbyterian Quarterly, IX (1895), 324-326.

2. T. E. Peck, Review of Shedd's Dogmatic Theology, Presbyterian Quarterly, III (1889), 288-292.

3. B. M. Smith, Review of Shedd's Commentary on Romans, Southern Presbyterian Review, XXXI (1880), 161-168.

3. A Summary of Shedd's System

Stripped of all save the essentials, the story conveyed by the theological system promoted and defended by Shedd is as follows: God, the perfect, personal, and triune Spirit, decreed, for a reason known only to Himself, that a physical universe should be created and sustained in being. God also decreed, for a reason known only to Himself, that humanity should be created and placed in this universe, in the form of a single man, a rational being like unto God and having a will inclined to holiness. But this inclination of humanity's will toward holiness was not fixed. It was possible for humanity, in the form of a single man, to change the inclination of the human will and give it a self-chosen direction, though there was no reason whatsoever that this should occur. Yet this self-determination of humanity's will, though contrary to reason and to God's desire, was made certain by God's permissive decree. However, not desiring that humanity should be forever the object of His wrath (as humanity would be, and deserved to be, following the self-determination of the human will away from holiness), God, the Father, in His grace, entered into a covenant with His Son, the Second Person of the Trinity, whereby the Son should, at a point in time, make atonement for the sins of humanity and obey the demands of righteousness in humanity's stead. Thus He would appease the Divine wrath and satisfy the Divine justice and

give the Divine good-will freedom to save humanity from eternal punishment and to eternal bliss. Knowing all this, God decreed that only a portion of humanity should benefit from this covenant and the atonement it provided. Then, with everything made infallibly certain by His decree, God brought to pass, in the realm of space and time, this which He had decreed.

Humanity was created in Adam, sinned in Adam, and was thereafter continued in being by God's Providence through individuals coming into the stream of history by common generation. Each of these human individuals comes into being as a corrupt and guilty person, deserving punishment for humanity's sin in Adam. Thus began the history of sinful humanity, which is the history of a downward development, sustained in being by God, but determined in the direction of its development by that sinfulness which humanity is totally incapable of stopping.

Into this stream of sinful humanity's development there came miraculous interventions by God, in the form of events and pronouncements of truth by men especially chosen and inspired by God for this purpose. As time went on, the written record of these events and words became the written revelation of God's purpose and of His redemptive activity. As many as believed this written record and looked forward in faith and hope to the promised Redeemer and His atoning work, were numbered among the elect. Their very believing and

trusting were evidence that God had redeemed them by the irresistible action of His regenerating grace.

Then, in the fullness of time, there came into the world a theanthropic person, a Divine Person who took unto Himself a bit of unindividualized and impersonalized humanity, and personalized it in such fashion as to become a unique person, one who was both God and man. This was the Second Person of the Holy Trinity become Jesus of Nazareth in order to make atonement for humanity's sin and to obey the demands of God's law in such fashion that His obedience could be imputed to men for righteousness. The testimony of certain chosen men to this theanthropic person's words, atoning death, and resurrection became a part of the written record. From that time forward, under the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, men began to unfold from the written revelation those fundamental truths which are necessary for their salvation. As many as do believe these truths are saved and assured of endless bliss with God in Heaven, for their very believing of these truths is evidence that God's regenerating grace has created faith within their hearts and thus effectually called them to be among the elect, that is, among those who shall be made perfectly holy at death and brought into never-ending fellowship with God. In heaven they will join the vast number of individualized personalities who died in infancy, which number, by their dying in infancy, witness to their election by God.

[illegible] so that God had redeemed them by the irresistible action of his regenerating grace.

Then, in the fulness of time, there came into the world [illegible] person, a divine Person who took unto himself [illegible] an impersonalized humanity, and personalized it in such fashion as to become a unique person, the same was both God and man. This was the second Person of the Holy Trinity become Jesus of Nazareth in order to make atonement for humanity's sin and to obey the demands of God's law in such fashion that his obedience could be imputed to men for righteousness. The testimony of certain chosen men [illegible] this theanthropic person's words, atoning death, and resurrection became a part of the written record. From that time forward, under the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, men began to unfold from the written revelation those fundamental truths which are necessary for their salvation. As many as do believe these truths are saved and assured of endless bliss with God in heaven, for their very believing of these truths is evidence [illegible] wrought faith within their hearts and thus effectively called them to be among the elect, that is, among those who shall be made perfectly holy at death and brought into never-ending fellowship with God. In heaven they will join the vast number of individualized personalities who died in infancy, [illegible], [illegible] of God.

This great throng of the saved, however, is not all of humanity. God, again for a reason known only to Himself, did not choose to exercise His free good-will and regenerate all men by the power of His irresistible grace, even though the atoning death and perfect righteousness of Christ had made such a choice possible for Him. Rather, God chose to pass by a great number and leave them to eternal punishment. This punishment forever redounds to the glory of that retributive justice which is God's most definitive attribute.

That, in brief, was the story conveyed by the theological system promoted and defended by Shedd. And, to paraphrase a comment which Edward D. Morris made concerning Shedd's affirmation and defense of Traducianism, it can be said of this whole system that Shedd, "apparently aware that his own view had been largely supplanted . . . still affirmed it and defended it with an uncompromising purpose, as if the very doctrine of salvation rested upon it."[4]

4. Critical Comment on Specific Aspects

a. Speculative Emphasis

The God described by Shedd is fundamentally the perfect, reasonable Being to whom the ontological argument points.

---

4. Edward D. Morris, "Dr. Shedd's System of Theology," Presbyterian Review, X (1889), 366.

This is the God of the scholastic philosophers, and He is approached through the rational use of ideas and definitions. It is in keeping with Shedd's admiration for Puritan "spirituality of mind" that he should choose to emphasize the God of one of the enduring and continuing philosophical traditions, but it is not without its difficulties in a Christian system. For example, it means that for all his insistence upon the importance of the written revelation, Shedd did not begin with this written revelation, but rather he began with an idea of God which he confessed to be written in the structure of his mind and which he afterward described in the manner of the traditional philosophers, and then, as has been pointed out, following the scholastic tradition, Shedd made the philosophical statements about God to be definitive for the subsequent interpretation of the written revelation. "It must be remembered," he said "that it is impossible to demonstrate the inspiration of the Bible, without proving that its teachings are in harmony with the true idea of God, and present rational and credible views of his works and ways."[5] Thus the written revelation is fitted into the framework of a traditional philosophy, and the God described by Shedd was characterized more by words like immutability, self-sufficiency, omniscience, omnipotence, and perfection--

---

5. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 6-7.

all words derived from philosophy, than by words derived from the Scriptures, words like jealous, gracious, holy, faithful, and full of loving-kindness and tender mercy.

In fact, when these Biblical words are used, they are always limited and defined by the manner in which they do, or do not, fit into the previously decided-upon scheme of philosophical terms, arrived at through natural reason. For example:

> The Scriptures attribute feelings to God, and nearly all forms of feeling common to man. That all of these are not intended to be understood as belonging to the Divine nature is plain, because some of them are incompatible with the idea of an infinite and perfect being . . . .[6]

The basis for judgment, says Shedd, is "the idea of an infinite and perfect being," that is, the idea of God as it has been consistently described in a philosophical tradition. Concerning this "infinite and perfect being" of the philosophers, these words of Etienne Vacherot are pertinent:

> What do you understand by God? . . . the perfect Being? He is the God of Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Malebranch, Leibnitz; he is the God of all the theologians with whom Divinity and Perfection are synonyms. That God is our God too. But, if of this God, immutable in his perfection, elevated beyond time, space, the movement of universal life, you make anything else than an ideal of the thought, I confess I no longer comprehend him. . . . These ideas, all equally reducible to the idea of the Perfect, . . . can have no objective reality, and only exist in the ideal order of pure

---

6. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 174.

thought; absolutely in the same manner as the figures of geometry do, which lose all the vigorousness and all the exactitude of their definition elsewhere than in the domain of the understanding. . . . Perfection exists, can only exist, in the thought. . . . A "perfect God," or a "real God?" Theology must make its choice. A Perfect God is only an Ideal God.[7]

Thus it is that there is an element of "unreality" about the God described by Shedd. In spite of his emphasis upon giving a rational explanation of Christian doctrine, Shedd's mingling of conceptions from philosophy, and conceptions from the language of the Bible, simply results in the heightening of the unintelligibility of God, and an over-emphasis upon His incomprehensibility. His procedure, therefore, casts a shadow on the reality of God, and, above all, it casts a shadow across the Biblical idea that God is a living God, known by His acts. "The living God is not known through thought, nor through conclusions drawn from the structure of the universe, nor through profound meditation on the nature of Spirit; He is known through revelation alone."[8]

This ideational and speculative emphasis drawn from the realm of traditional philosophy had many consequences in the theological system expounded by Shedd. His commitment to

---

7. Etienne Vacherot, "La Metaphysique et la science," quoted in Guizot, Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity (New York, 1866), pp. 385-386.

8. Emil Brunner, Revelation and Reason (Philadelphia, 1946), p. 44.

this emphasis led him to make qualifying statements, and to incorporate philosophical speculations within the body of his doctrine to such an extent that some of the results should be specified here: He made much of the processes of generation and spiration which, he said, were eternally going on within God and thus accounting for the eternity of the Son and the Holy Spirit; he emphasized the omnipotence of God in the Divine Decree to such an extent that even with carefully worded qualifying statements he could not keep his system from having about it the sound and feel of the unfolding of a Divine Determinism; he emphasized the self-sufficiency and immutability of God to the point which made it impossible for him to give any reason for God's decision to create a finite world and put man in it; he emphasized the immutability of God to the point where it was impossible for him to give any independence whatsoever to man, nor could he present God in such fashion that it could be said the God actually responded to His creation and His creatures; he made so much of irresistible grace that it became clear that the damnation of those who suffer eternal punishment is simply the result of God's choice not to save them; he guarded every occasion in which it was necessary for him to speak of the love of God, lest he give the impression that God actually sought communion with man, or even, as Luther said, "loved the sinner"; and he so surrounded the incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity with qualifications designed to maintain

the immutability of the Second Person of the Trinity (as, for example, his treatment of the metaphysical impossibility of sin in Christ), that he made it difficult to discover wherein the incarnation is a real incarnation, and Christ's humanity is real humanity.

These things which followed upon Shedd's speculative emphasis have tremendous implications as to the genuineness of his orthodoxy. Any theological system which beclouds the fact of a real incarnation, which casts doubt upon the reality of the humanity of Christ, which makes it difficult to understand how God could, in any way, respond to His creatures, and who so qualifies the love of God as to make it a matter of secondary importance--that theological system is not truly orthodox, nor is it a true unfolding of the message of Scripture.

b. Inerrancy: Biblical and Traditional

Whereas the Westminster Confession, and the ordination vows of officers in the Presbyterian Church, assert that the Scriptures are "the only infallible rule of faith and practice," Shedd took it as his task to defend with vigor the view that the Scriptures are an infallible, inerrant, body of information. Thus he added to the already great difficulty besetting the Church the difficulty of maintaining the authority of the Bible.

In subjecting Shedd's view of Holy Scripture to criticism, nothing should be said which could be interpreted as criticizing him for not having a mid-twentieth-century approach to the Bible. He lived in his time and must be evaluated on that basis. However, he had available to him the same knowledge that was available to his colleague on the Union Seminary faculty, Charles A. Briggs. That he used his knowledge of how men of the past had viewed Scripture differently than Briggs used that same knowledge, is a matter of record, and was a matter of his own choice. Since the two of them were in sharp contrast and in bitter conflict, it behooves the student of that period to choose between Shedd and Briggs as to which one held that point of view which offered the Church the more trustworthy weapons for its struggle to maintain the authority of the Bible. Those who choose to side with Briggs find Shedd to have increased the difficulty of the Church's struggle by insisting upon (1) the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, and (2) historical faith as a necessary prelude to saving faith.[8a] Each of these parts of Shedd's view of Scripture will be dealt with in turn.

8a. On these matters, see Briggs, Whither?, pp. 63-90; and Briggs, The Bible, the Church, and the Reason, pp. 2-12, 91-116.

In analyzing Shedd's view of Holy Scripture it is criti-
cal, nothing should be said which could be interpreted as
criticizing him for not having a mid-twentieth-century ap-
proach to the Bible. He lived in his time and must be evalu-
ated on that basis. However, he had available to him the
same knowledge that was available to his colleague on the
Union Seminary faculty, Charles A. Briggs. That he used his
knowledge of the men of the past and viewed Scripture dif-
ferently than Briggs used that same knowledge, is a matter of
record, and was a matter of his own choice. Since the two of
them were in sharp contrast and in bitter conflict, it be-
comes the student of that period to choose between Shedd and
Briggs as to which one held that point of view which offered
the Church the more trustworthy weapons for its struggle to
maintain the authority of the Bible. Those who choose to
side with Briggs find Shedd to have increased the difficulty
of the Church's struggle by insisting upon (1) the inerrancy
of Holy Scripture, and (2) historical faith as a necessary
prelude to saving faith.[38] Each of these parts of Shedd's
view of Scripture will be dealt with in turn.

---

38. [illegible]

(1) Biblical Inerrancy

Shedd defended the view that "nothing erroneous or false is to be found" in the written revelation. "God, the Holy Spirit, inspires no error, great or small."[9] This freedom from error, he held, is the result of the extraordinary exertion of Divine power which brought about the inspiration of those who wrote. Furthermore, this freedom from error extends to the historical, geographical, chronological, and physical elements of the Biblical narratives.

On one occasion, however, Shedd qualified this view, saying: "The inspired writers were permitted to employ the astronomy and physics of the people and age to which they themselves belonged, because the true astronomy and physics would have been unintelligible."[10] This qualification, had anything been made of it by Shedd himself, would have been a genuine help to many who were unnecessarily troubled by the conflict between the astronomy of the Bible and that of their own age. Furthermore, the implications of the above quotation could have been helpful in any number of places where Scripture descriptions seemed, or were, in conflict with the descriptions of scientists or historians. Nevertheless,

---

9. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, III, 28; Shedd, Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, p. 141.

10. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 104.

Shedd made nothing of this qualification, nor of its implications, choosing rather to throw in his lot with that group of American theologians who were holding out for the inerrancy of Scripture on all subjects. Shedd's criticism of the view which Coleridge advanced concerning Scripture served well to put Shedd among those who yoked "inspiration" and "inerrancy" together, inseparably. For Shedd, the Bible was a book of inerrant information.

It was the danger which inhered in this unnecessary yoking of "inspiration" and "inerrancy" which moved Briggs to denounce it with such vigor. He marshalled quotations from twenty-three Christian scholars who admitted the presence of errors in the Bible.[11] And these scholars were not limited to any single historical era. Shedd, however, who was a recognized scholar in the field of Church history, did not give any indication that he appreciated the fact that insistence upon complete inerrancy was not a part of traditional Christianity. Neither did he write anything which indicated that he wanted to disassociate himself from those more rigid than he who equated the very authority of the Bible with its proved inerrancy. Of the danger of this position, Briggs wrote:

---

11. Briggs, The Bible, the Church, and the Reason, pp. 215-235.

> No more dangerous doctrine has ever come from the pen of men. It has cost the Church the loss of thousands. It will cost us ten thousand and hundreds of thousands unless the true Westminster doctrine is speedily put in its place. This false doctrine . . . . is one of the reasons of the outcry against Biblical criticism.[12]

Briggs' evaluation of the danger inherent in this point of view, and his estimate of the loss to the Church, are both matters for individual judgment. However, this statement highlights the point that is made here: Shedd's insistence upon the inerrancy of Scripture was no help whatever to the Church in its struggle to maintain the authority of the Bible in a day when the traditional theories of inspiration could no longer be maintained.

(2) Traditional Inerrancy

Shedd not only linked "inspiration" with "inerrancy of the Scriptures," but went further and linked "inspiration" with "faith in the historical tradition concerning the authorship of the books of Scripture." He wrote: "Christian apologetes assume that if it could be proved incontrovertibly that a particular book was not written by or under the guidance of a prophet or apostle, it is not inspired."[13] He

---

12. Briggs, Whither?, p. 73.

13. Shedd, Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy, p. 139.

further declared: "God leaves the question respecting the authorship of particular books to be settled chiefly by historical testimony; and from the nature of the case, by the testimony of the earlier generations."[14] Then he defined this "belief in testimony" as "historical faith." "Historical faith is merely belief in the authenticity and canonicity of Scripture, yet this historical faith precedes and is necessary in order to saving faith."[15] Here is dangerous doctrine of the first magnitude. Though it was no more than what Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield were declaring to be the necessary yoking of "inspiration" and "authenticity of authorship," it was nevertheless dangerous; for, as Briggs said, if this theory of inspiration be right, then the only way to save the Bible is to destroy the "higher critics."[16] Which is just what the Church, following this theory of inspiration, tried to do, as the Briggs Case and the Preserved Smith Case testified!

Such a conflict within the Church was not necessary. It happened only because the Church followed the leadership of men who made the authority of the Bible depend upon their particular theory of inspiration. By persisting in their

---

14. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 143.

15. Ibid., III, 87.

16. Briggs, Whither?, p. 86.

views, Shedd and his allies made it necessary for men to choose between Biblical criticism and orthodoxy. History bears record to the way in which the choice was made. Thus, the earlier judgment must be repeated: Shedd increased the Church's difficulty in the struggle to maintain the authority of the Bible.

The Westminster Confession does not require such a view of traditions regarding Scripture. It was to the credit of Briggs that he made this evident. One quotation will suffice here to illustrate the approach of the Westminster Assembly:

> If any chapter in the Confession was more carefully framed than another, it was this, "of the Holy Scripture." It formed the subject of repeated and earnest debate in the House of Commons as well as in the Assembly; and I think it requires only to be fairly examined to make it appear that its framers were so far from desiring to go beyond their predecessors in rigour, that they were at more special pains than the authors of any other Confession,--1. To avoid mixing up the question of the canonicity of particular books with the question of their authorship, where any doubt at all existed on the latter point; 2. To leave open all reasonable questions as to the mode and degree of inspiration which could consistently be left open by those who accepted the Scriptures as the infallible rule of faith and duty; 3. To refrain from claiming for the text such absolute purity, and for the Hebrew vowel points such antiquity, as was claimed in the Swiss Formula Concordiae, while asserting that the originals of Scripture are, after the lapse of ages, still pure and perfect for all those purposes for which they were given; . . .[17]

---

17. Briggs, Whither?, p. 89, quoting A. F. Mitchell, Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, Introduction, p. xlix.

lines, [illegible] and his allies made it necessary for men to choose between Biblical criticism and orthodoxy. History bears plainly on the way in which the choice was made. Thus, the earlier judgment must be reopened: Briggs increased the Church's difficulty in the struggle to maintain the unanimity of the Union.

The Westminster Confession does not require such a view of traditions regarding Scripture. It was to the credit of Briggs that he made this evident. One quotation will suffice here to illustrate the approach of the Westminster Assembly.

> If any chapter in the Confession was more carefully framed than another, it was this, "Of the Holy Scripture." It formed the subject of repeated and earnest debate in the House of Commons as well as in the Assembly; and it only requires only to be fairly examined to make it appear that its framers were so far from desiring to go beyond their predecessors in rigour, that they were at more special pains than the framers of any other Confession,--1. To avoid mixing up the question of the canonicity of particular books with the question of their authorship, where any doubt at all existed on the latter point: 2. To leave open all reasonable questions as to the mode and degree of inspiration which could consistently be left open by those who accepted the Scriptures as the infallible rule of faith and duty; 3. To refrain from claiming for the text such absolute purity, and for the Hebrew vowel points such antiquity, as was claimed by the Swiss Formula Consensus, while asserting that the originals of Scripture are, after the lapse of ages, still pure and perfect for all those purposes for which they were given. . . .1/

1/. Briggs, Whither?, p. 69, quoting A. F. Mitchell, Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, Introduction, p. xlix.

If this be the true interpretation of the Westminster Assembly, then it is clear that Shedd went beyond that Assembly in his theory of inspiration. And, by going beyond that orthodoxy which he sought to promote and defend, he proved himself, in his Biblicism, as in his Scholasticism, neither a truly orthodox theologian nor a really trustworthy Biblical scholar. His emphasis, both as influenced by his philosophy and by his theories of the Bible, proved to be an emphasis which was neither truly Christian nor truly Biblical.

c. Christology

These emphases on scholasticism and Biblicism were made by Shedd in preference to the growing Christocentric emphasis in Christian thought. This Christocentric emphasis had in it the elements of a more Christian and a more Biblical theology than the one expounded by Shedd. Yet Shedd had in his own writings an emphasis which this growing Christocentric movement in theology needed. That Shedd did not learn from and appreciate more the Christocentric movement in theology was his great failure. And that this growing theological movement did not appreciate some of the emphasis which was in Shedd's writings proved to be one of the shortcomings of the Christocentric movement in theology.

Looking at this in retrospect, it is well to repeat one of Shedd's paragraphs. He wrote:

If this is the true interpretation of the Westminster statement, then it is clear that Shedd went beyond that Assembly in his theory of inspiration. And, by going beyond that theology which he sought to promote and defend, he proves himself, in his biblicism, as in his scholasticism, neither a truly Reformed theologian nor a really trustworthy biblical scholar. His emphasis, both as influenced by his philosophy and by his theories of the Bible, proved to be an emphasis which was neither truly Christian nor truly biblical.

5. Christology

These emphases on scholasticism and biblicism were made by Shedd in preference to the growing Christocentric emphasis in Christian thought. This Christocentric emphasis had in it the elements of a more Christian and a more biblical theology than the one expounded by Shedd. Yet Shedd had in his own writings an emphasis which this growing Christocentric movement in theology needed. That Shedd did not learn from and appreciate more the Christocentric movement in theology was his great failure. And that this growing theological movement did not appreciate some of the emphasis which was in Shedd's teachings [illegible] Christocentric movement in theology.

Looking at this in retrospect, it is well to repeat one of Shedd's paragraphs. He wrote:

> This doctrine of expiation, in the Christian system, is like a ganglion in the human frame; it is a knot of nerves; it is the oscillating centre where several primal and vital truths meet in unity. This single doctrine of sacrificial oblation is a vast implication. It implies the personality of God, with all its elements of power. It involves the absolute self-will and responsibility of the creature in the origin of sin. It implies the necessary, inexorable nature of justice. And, if we analyze these things again, we shall find them full of "the seeds of all things," full of the substance and staple of both ethics and evangelism. Those portions of the Bible, therefore, which treat of this central truth of Christianity, either directly or indirectly, should receive the most serious and careful investigation.[18]

In those words Shedd had the beginning of a theological system which took its start from, and kept as its definitive principle, something directly out of the Person and work of Jesus Christ. Here Shedd was at one with James Denney, a younger contemporary of his. In the book The Death of Christ Denney said:

> If it is a right conception of the Atonement which enables us to attain to a right conception of the Person of Christ, similarly we may say it is through a right conception of the Atonement that we come to a right conception of the nature or character of God. In the Atonement revelation is complete, and we must have it fully in view in all affirmations we make about God as the ultimate truth and reality.[19]

Unfortunately, however, Denney also wrote, "I have no intention of outlining a system of theology in which the atonement

---

18. Shedd, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, pp. 270-272.

19. James Denney, The Death of Christ (New York, 1903), pp. 327-328.

made in the death of Christ should be the determinative principle."[20] And, though the atoning death of Jesus Christ was his preoccupation, Denney did not expound a full system of theology in which the atonement made in the death of Christ was the determinative principle. And, as has been indicated in this thesis, Shedd, for all his emphasis upon the atonement, did not make it definitive for his theology. This was unfortunate, among other reasons, simply because at the time of Shedd's influence, and at the time of the influence of Denney, men were looking for a determinative principle for theology which derived from the person and work of Jesus Christ. And, some men believed that they had found it. Their theology was the theological movement with a growing edge as the nineteenth century closed and the twentieth century began. It is with that theological movement, and with Shedd's refusal either to seek to appreciate it, or to influence it, that the remainder of these pages will deal.

In the early summer of 1890, Professor Lewis French Stearns received a unanimous call from Union Seminary to the chair of systematic theology, made vacant by the resignation of Dr. Shedd. He declined the call. However, it is of interest that Union sought to fill Shedd's chair with an avowed Christocentric theologian. In June, 1881, Professor Stearns'

---

20. Denney, op. cit., pp. 312-313.

[illegible] Jesus of white Christ as the determinative [illegible].[20] [illegible], though the atoning death of Jesus within [illegible] tion, Jenney did not develop a full system [illegible] in which the atonement was in the death of [illegible] was the determinative principle. And, as has been [illegible] in this thesis, Shedd, for all his emphasis upon the atonement, did not make it definitive for his theology. [illegible] was ultimately, among other reasons, simply because in the line of Shedd's influence, and at the time of the [illegible] Jenney, men were looking for a determinative principle [illegible] which derived from the Person and Work of [illegible] Christ. And, some men believed that they had found it. [illegible] theology was the theological movement with a growing [illegible] the nineteenth century closed and the twentieth century began. It is with that theological movement, and with [illegible]'s refusal either to seem to appreciate it, or to [illegible] it, that the remainder of these pages will deal.

[illegible] the early summer of 1893, Professor Lewis French [illegible] received a unanimous call from Union Seminary to the [illegible] of systematic theology, made vacant by the resignation [illegible] Shedd. He declined the call. However, it is of [illegible] that Union sought to fill Shedd's chair with an avowed [illegible] theologian. In June, 1893, Professor Stearns' [illegible]

---

20. [illegible], [illegible], pp. [illegible].

inaugural address as Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological Seminary at Bangor, Maine, was delivered, and in January, 1882, it was printed in The New Englander. Excerpts from this address read as follows:

It is in the man Christ Jesus that this generation has been taught to discover the God who was manifest in the flesh . . . . The system of Christian doctrine must find its center in Christ. The old reformed theology, the theology of Calvin and of the Westminster and Savoy confessions, the theology of our American Calvinistic churches, centered in the decrees of God. It was a high thought to begin thus back in the eternal purpose of the Almighty, and from that transcendent standpoint to develop the whole system of Christian faith. The result was a logical, powerful, most coherent whole. In all the modifications of Calvinism, from Edwards to Emmons, that centre was maintained; but it is so no longer. Long ago, Christian thought, quietly and scarcely aware of the change it was undergoing--a revolution almost as great as that through which science passed in its transition from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican system--detached itself from the old centre and began to swing freely around the new. The former system, with all its elevation of the divine sovereignty, was narrow and mechanical. Its theodicy failed just where it was most needed. It placed the doctrine of election, which is true and scriptural as the practical corollary of the divine efficiency in regeneration and sanctification, at the forefront and subordinated everything to it. In it the elect were everything, and everything was for the elect; but the new theology finds another centre. It is fitting that Christ, who is the historical centre of the Christian religion, as he is the vital centre of his church, should be the centre of the theological system. About him all the truths and doctrines group themselves.[21]

Just a year after he had declined the call to be Shedd's successor at Union Seminary, Stearns, in a paper read before the International Congregational Council in London, said:

---

21. Lewis F. Stearns, Present Day Theology, Preface, pp. xi-xii.

"We are coming more distinctly to recognize the central place of the living Christ in our theological thought."[22] It was in this paper that he used the interesting word "Christologize." He said:

> We are trying to "Christologize" our doctrine of God, to set Him forth as He is seen in the fact of Jesus Christ. And, as we are learning to Christologize the doctrine of God, we are learning to do the same with the doctrines of the eternal plan, of creation, and of providence . . . .[23]

The word "Christologize" is interesting because Stearns got it from Henry Boynton Smith, Shedd's predecessor in the chair of systematic theology at Union Seminary. Stearns, in his life of Smith, wrote that the word "Christologize" seems to have been of Smith's coining, appearing first in an article in the Presbyterian Review, and later in Smith's Introduction to Christian Theology. The article in the Presbyterian Review of 1884 included this sentence: "What Reformed theology has got to do is to Christologize predestination and decrees; regeneration and sanctification; the doctrine of the Church; and the whole of the Eschatology."[24]

Henry Boynton Smith's theological reputation was made on the basis of an address, "Faith and Philosophy," which was

---

22. Stearns, Present Day Theology, p. 540.

23. Ibid., pp. 540-541.

24. Stearns, Henry Boynton Smith (Boston, 1892), p. 136.

later published in both the United States and England. In this address he said:

This, then, is the primary aspect in which the Christian faith is to be viewed; as an historical reality, confirmed by experience, influencing history, and professing to solve the great questions of our destiny, and all centring in Jesus Christ, a personal object of faith and love, the very manifestation of God here upon earth.[25]

He is the centre of God's revelation and of man's redemption; of Christian doctrine and Christian history, of conflicting sects and of each believer's faith, yea, of the very history of this, our earth, Jesus Christ is the full, the radiant, the only centre--fitted to be such because he is the God-man and the Redeemer: Christ--Christ, He is the centre of the Christian system, and the doctrine respecting Christ is the heart of Christian theology.[26]

This was, for Smith, but the furthering of something he had set himself to do at an earlier date. In 1836, on the occasion of his twenty-first birthday, he wrote to his friend, Goodwin:

I can not find truth in any one systematic view of it. I can not find religious truth in the Old School or the New. I find it only in the doctrine of redemption. My object is to make and harmonize a system which shall make Christ the central point of all important religious truth and doctrine. Such, I am convinced, is the Biblical scheme. Does any human scheme correspond to this? Such a system, too, would be a practical system; it would, at any rate, require that all preaching should be made in reference to Christ; of course in reference to redemption and sanctification, and Christ as the cause of both.[27]

---

25. Stearns, Henry Boynton Smith, p. 122.

26. Ibid., p. 129. 27. Ibid., p. 31.

[illegible] in both the United States and England. In

[illegible]:

[illegible], then, is the primary aspect in which the Christian faith is [illegible] viewed; as an historical reality, confirmed by [illegible], influencing history, and professing to solve the great questions of our destiny, and all centring in Jesus Christ, a personal object of faith and love, the very mani-[illegible] of God here upon earth.25

[illegible] is the centre of God's revelation and of man's redemption; of [illegible] doctrine and Christian history, of [illegible] [illegible] of each believer's faith, yea, of the very history of [illegible] earth, Jesus Christ is the Fact, the Person, the only [illegible]--fitted to be such because he is the [illegible] the [illegible]: Christ--[illegible], he is the centre of the [illegible] system, and the doctrine respecting Christ is the [illegible] of Christian theology.26

This was, far [illegible], but the furthering of something he had set himself to do at an earlier date. In [illegible], on the occa-sion of his twenty-first birthday, he wrote to his friend [illegible]:

I [illegible] find truth in any one systematic view of it. I [illegible] that religious truth in the old school or the new. I find it only in the doctrine of redemption. My object is to [illegible] and harmonize a system which shall make Christ the cen-tral point of all important religious truth and doctrine. [illegible], I am convinced, is the [illegible] scheme. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] correspond to this: such a system, too, would [illegible] a practical system; it would, at any rate, require that all preaching should be made in reference to Christ; of course in reference to redemption and sanctification, and Christ as the [illegible] of both.27

25. [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], p. [illegible].

26. Ibid., p. 125. 27. Ibid., p. 31.

In addition to Shedd's predecessor in the chair of systematic theology at Union Seminary, and to the man first chosen to be Shedd's successor in that chair, the man who actually did succeed Shedd was a Christocentric theologian. William Adams Brown, when he delivered his inaugural address as successor to Shedd, entitled his address, "Christ the Vitalizing Principle in Theology." On a later occasion, he said that one thing he had long believed, and the thing that he thought all Christians really need to know and agree upon, is that "God has made the life of a man like ourselves the vehicle of His revelation to us."[28]

This emphasis upon the revelatory value of the life of Christ was part of the emphasis of the times. Phillip Schaff, a fellow faculty member with Shedd at Union, was a champion of Christocentric theology. While Shedd was on the faculty at Andover Seminary, Schaff delivered lectures there which were later published as a book under the title, The Person of Christ: The Perfection of His Humanity Viewed as a Proof of His Divinity.

Christocentric theologians were not limited to Union Seminary. Shedd's successor in the chair of ecclesiastical history at Andover Seminary, Egbert Smyth, was also such a theologian. Smyth interpreted Christocentric theology to be

---

28. William Adams Brown, How to Think of Christ, p. 261.

"not a theology that centers in what is commonly understood by the words 'historic Christ,' but one which centers in God as revealed in Christ." "Everything in Christianity," he wrote, "centers in Christ."[29]

Here then, all around Shedd, was a theological movement which had in it the corrective emphasis which his theology needed. What is more, it was a movement which did not make a clear break with the theological past; nor did it deny future progress. It recognized its debt to the past and sought to give the Church the best theology possible for the future. It offered an outlet for the finest of talents, in the service of a theology which, though not likely to fit into the organization which had characterized the orthodox system, was nevertheless orthodox, in that it was focused where the Bible is focused, upon God's revealing, redeeming work in Jesus Christ. This was the more Christian and the more Biblical theology which the Church needed in Shedd's day.

Shedd recognized this to be the direction which Jonathan Edwards had chosen in his unfinished work, "History of Redemption."[30] What Shedd did not recognize, and perhaps could not be expected to recognize, is that this Christocentric

---

29. Quoted in John W. Buckham, Progressive Religious Thought in America (Boston, 1919), p. 201.

30. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, I, 5-6.

emphasis is to be found in John Calvin. The advance advertisement of a soon-to-be-released book reads: "The author shows '. . . that in every aspect of doctrine Calvin is concerned about only one thing--the God revealed in flesh--Jesus Christ controls not only the content, but also the form of Calvinistic thought."[31] Whether or not the author, Wilhelm Niesel, really accomplishes that, his effort is in keeping with the direction that some Calvin studies have taken in the recent past. Rupert E. Davies[32] and A. Mitchell Hunter[33] both discover a Christocentric emphasis in Calvin, but find it to be overshadowed by his Biblical literalism. Edward A. Dowey, Jr.,[34] assesses the two emphases to be more nearly balanced. Dowey writes:

> [Calvin] developed a lofty, psychologically subtle, and exclusively Christocentric doctrine of faith that could have come only from a living faith unencumbered by heteronomous formal authority, yet, as far as his theology in general was concerned, he was never willing to deny authority to a single casual expression in Scripture.[35]

---

31. Wilhelm Niesel, The Theology of Calvin (Philadelphia, 1956), as advertised on the back cover of Theology Today, vol. XIII, no. 3 (October, 1956).

32. Rupert E. Davies, The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers (London, 1946).

33. A. Mitchell Hunter, The Teaching of Calvin (London, 1950).

34. Edward A. Dowey, Jr., The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology (New York, 1952).

35. Ibid., p. 161.

It is in his exegetical work that Calvin's Christocentric emphasis is to be found. This is true in spite of the fact that the Christocentric doctrine of faith mentioned by Dowey is to be found in the Institutes.[36] From Calvin's exegetical writings the following extracts suggest the point here being made:

> Everything which faith ought to contemplate is exhibited to us in Christ, hence it follows that a bare and a confused knowledge of God is not taken for faith, but that which is directed to Christ in order to seek God in him, and this can not be except where the power and offices of Christ are understood.[37]

> This [Romans 1:3] is a remarkable passage, by which we are taught that the whole gospel is included in Christ, so that if any removes one step from Christ, he withdraws himself from the gospel. For since he is the living and express image of the Father, it is no wonder, that he alone is set before us as one to whom our whole faith is to be directed, and in whom it is to centre . . . . He who has made a due proficiency in the knowledge of Christ, has acquired everything which can be learned from the gospel; and on the other hand, they who seek to be wise without Christ, are not only foolish, but even completely insane.[38]

---

36. John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by John Allen. Seventh American edition, revised and corrected (Philadelphia, 1936), III, ii, 7 and 29.

37. John Calvin, Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians. Translated by William Pringle (Edinburgh, 1854), comment on Ephesians, vs. 12, chap. 3.

38. John Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Translated and edited by John Owen (Edinburgh, 1849), comment on vs. 3, chap. 1.

It is Christ alone on whom, strictly speaking, faith ought to look. . . . This is the proper look of faith, to be fixed on Christ.[39]

These extracts, together with the longer portions of Calvin's writing which surround the "I am" sayings of Jesus Christ in the Gospel of John, serve as a good starting point for a study of the Christocentrism of Calvin. The results of such a study are such as to give support to Dowey's suggestion that--

While there remain in his theology all too ample grounds for the turn that Calvinistic orthodoxy took--the newness of the so-called New Reformation theology is more than anything else an affirmation that living faith in Christ as conceived by the Reformers has survived the nineteenth century's successful attack upon the formal authority of the sacred canon. That both Luther and Calvin found Christ, and not a book, the real center and object of faith long before criticism became powerful shows that the rediscovery of the Gospel in this century by those who no longer can consider the Bible's inerrancy an axiom of faith is not a retreat, but a rediscovery of one of the deep insights of the reformation.[40]

It is of this latter aspect that Robert McAfee Brown was thinking and writing when, in his discussion of P. T. Forsyth's travel along the way of theological development, he wrote: "Forsyth read Maurice, Ritschl, Luther, and Calvin,

---

39. John Calvin, Commentary on the Gospel According to John. Translated by William Pringle (Edinburgh, 1847), comment on vs. 16, chap. 3.

40. Dowey, op. cit., p. 163.

and found them all pointing back to the contemporaneously living Word of God in Jesus Christ, mediated through the sacramental Book."[41]

Of the difference between faith in a book and faith in a person, a contemporary of Shedd, Dr. L. W. Batten, St. Mark's Church-in-the-Bowery, wrote in 1900:

> If the godly men of the post-Reformation age had fixed upon Christ as the foundation of their religion, and had valued the Scriptures because they bore witness to Him, they would have taken a position from which no criticism could have dislodged them, and the Church might have looked complacently upon the works of the scholars of the last century, knowing that their conclusions could not prove disastrous.[42]

To that there have been many in these decades since Shedd who have said a hearty "Amen," and have remembered that Saint Paul said: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."[43]

Although a study of Shedd's writings affords opportunity for a greater appreciation of many of those things he said centered in the doctrine of sin's expiation on the cross, and makes it possible to identify more clearly some of the things which were little emphasized in the Christocentric movement

---

41. Robert McAfee Brown, P. T. Forsyth: Prophet for Today (Philadelphia, 1952), p. 21.

42. J. V. Morgan, ed., Theology at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century, p. 44.

43. I Corinthians 3:11.

and found them all pointing back to the contemporaneously living Word of God in Jesus Christ, mediated through the [illegible] Book.41

Of the difference between faith in a book and faith in a person, a contemporary of Shedd, Dr. L. W. Batten, St. Mark's Church-in-the-Bowery, wrote in 1900:

> If the godly men of the post-Reformation age had fixed upon Christ as the foundation of their religion, and had valued the Scriptures because they bore witness to Him, they would have taken a position from which no criticism could have dislodged them, and the Church might have looked complacently upon the work of the scholars of the last century, knowing that their conclusions could not prove disastrous.42

[illegible] that there have been many in these decades since Shedd who have said a hearty "Amen," and have remembered that which Paul said: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."43

Although a study of Shedd's writings affords opportunity for a greater appreciation of many of those things he said centered in the doctrine of sin's expiation on the cross, and makes it possible to identify more clearly some of the things which were little emphasized in the Christocentric movement.

---

41. [illegible] (Philadelphia, [illegible]), p. [illegible].

42. L. W. Batten, [illegible], p. [illegible].

43. I Corinthians 3:11.

which gave direction to American theology of the Reformed tradition, still, a greater value to be gained from a study of Shedd's writings lies in the opportunity it affords for a greater appreciation of just what these Christocentric theologians were striving to restore to Christian theology.

[illegible]

[illegible], still, a greater value to be gained from a stud[y] of [illegible]'s writings lies in the opportunity it affords for a greater appreciation of just what these jurisconsults [illegible] were striving to restore to Christian Society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS USED IN PREPARATION OF DISSERTATION

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS USED IN PREPARATION OF DISSERTATION

I. THE WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GREENOUGH THAYER SHEDD

A. Books

Calvinism: Pure and Mixed. New York, 1893.

Commentary Upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. New York, 1879.

The Doctrine of Endless Punishment. New York, 1886.

Dogmatic Theology. Third edition; New York, 1891. Volumes I and II.

Dogmatic Theology. First edition; New York, 1893. Volume III.

Dogmatic Theology. Classic Reprint edition; Grand Rapids, 1953. Volumes I, II and III.

A History of Christian Doctrine. Fourteenth edition; New York, 1902. Two volumes.

Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. Eighth edition; New York, 1875.

Lectures Upon the Philosophy of History. Andover, 1857.

Lectures Upon the Philosophy of History. Boston, 1861.

Literary Essays. New York, 1878.

Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy. New York, 1893.

Sermons to the Natural Man. New York, 1873.

Sermons to the Spiritual Man. New York, 1884.

Theological Essays. New York, 1877.

B. Translations and Editions

Augustine, Aurelius. On the Holy Trinity. Translated by Arthur W. Haddam. Revised and annotated, together with an introductory essay, by W. G. T. Shedd. In A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Philip Schaff. New York, 1887. III, 1-228.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, with an introductory essay by the editor. Edited by W. G. T. Shedd. New York, 1868. Seven volumes.

Guericke, Henry E. F. A Manual of Church History. Translated by W. G. T. Shedd. Andover, 1859.

Theremin, Francis. Eloquence a Virtue. Translated by W. G. T. Shedd. Revised edition; Andover, 1859.

C. Articles

"The Atonement a Satisfaction for the Ethical Nature of Both God and Man." Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository, LXI (October, 1859), 723-763.

"Bushnell on the Atonement." American Theological Review, IV (January, 1867), 162-172.

"College Education." Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review, VII (January, 1850), 132-142.

"Comparative Certainty of Physics and Metaphysics." _Presbyterian Review_, III (January, 1882), 1-13.

"The Distinctive Nature of Homiletics." _American Theological Review_, III (July, 1865), 384-395.

"How Were the Four Gospels Composed?" _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, IV (July, 1893), 461-469.

"Hume, Huxley on Miracles." _Presbyterian Review_, I (January, 1880), 8-33.

"The Impeccability of Christ." _Presbyterian Review_, IX (October, 1888), 555-568.

"Materialistic Physics Unmathematical." _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, II (April, 1891), 323-326.

"Maxims for Sermonizing." _American Theological Review_, IV (January, 1867), 9-33.

"The Meaning and Value of the Doctrine of Decrees." _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, I (January, 1890), 1-25.

"The Nature and Influence of the Historic Spirit." _Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository_, XI (April, 1854), 345-394.

"Notes on Current Topics." _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, III (April, 1892), 313-322.

"The Ontological Argument for Divine Existence." _Presbyterian Review_, V (April, 1884), 213-227.

"The Relation of Language to Thought." _Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review_, V (November, 1848), 650-662.

"The Relation of Style to Thought." _Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository_, VIII (July, 1851), 491-502.

"Sin a Nature and That Nature Guilt." _The Christian Review_, XVII (January, 1852), 1-32.

"The True Tone in Preaching and the True Temper in Hearing." _The Princeton Review_, XXXV (July, 1863), 416-439.

"What Is Animal Life?" _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, I (July, 1890), 443-447.

D. Reviews

Comments on "Questions on the Text of the Systematic Theology of Dr. Charles Hodge," by A. A. Hodge. Presbyterian Review, VI (April, 1885), 372.

Review of Apologetics: a Course of Lectures, by Henry B. Smith. Presbyterian Review, III (April, 1882), 426-427.

Review of Augustinische Studien, by Herman Reuter. Presbyterian Review, IX (April, 1888), 331.

Review of Dabney's Syllabus of Theology. Presbyterian Review, I (April, 1880), 389-391.

Review of Darstellung der Christlichen Glaubenslehre auf Reformirt-Kirchlicher Grundlage, by Edward Bohl. Presbyterian Review, IX (April, 1888), 330-331.

Review of A Higher Catechism of Theology, by William Pope. Presbyterian Review, V (October, 1884), 746-[illegible]

Review of The Humiliation of Christ, by A. B. Bruce. Presbyterian Review, II (April, 1881), 618-621.

Review of Is There Salvation After Death? by E. D. Morris. Presbyterian Review, IX (January, 1888), 158-160.

Review of Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, by Alfred Edersheim. Presbyterian Review, V (January, 1884), 166-168.

Review of The Miraculous Element in the Gospels, by A. B. Bruce. Presbyterian Review, VIII (January, 1887), 162-166.

Review of Popular Lectures on Theological Themes, by A. A. Hodge. Presbyterian Review, VIII (October, 1887), 756-758.

Review of The True Humanity of Christ, by Howard Crosby. Presbyterian Review, II (April, 1881), 429-433.

II. BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL CONCERNING WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD

The Cyclopedia of American Biographies. Edited by John H. Brown. Boston, 1903. Volume VII.

DeWitt, John. "William Greenough Thayer Shedd." _Presbyterian and Reformed Review_, VI (April, 1895), 295-322.

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by Dumas Malone. New York, 1935. Volume XVII.

Gordon, Peter. "Letter to the Editor." _Christian Magazine of the South_, VII (September, 1850), 272.

Kunitz, S. J. and H. Haycraft. _American Authors, 1600-1900._ New York, 1938.

National Cyclopedia of American Biography. New York, 1897. Volume VII.

Prentiss, George L. _The Union Theological Seminary._ New York, 1899.

Presbyterian Reunion Memorial Volume. New York, 1871.

Smart, Isaac Chippman. "William Greenough Thayer Shedd." _The Vermont Alumni Weekly_, V (Burlington, Vermont: May 5, 1926).

Thompson, Robert Ellis. _A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States._ (_American Church History Series_, Volume VI) Third edition; New York, 1907.

III. REVIEWS AND ARTICLES CONCERNED WITH SHEDD'S WRITINGS

Alexander, W. M. Review of _Calvinism: Pure and Mixed_, by W. G. T. Shedd. _Union Seminary Magazine_, VII (November, 1895), 143-145.

Beattie, Francis. Review of _Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy_, by W. G. T. Shedd. _Presbyterian Quarterly_, VIII (April, 1894), 296-298.

DeWitt, John. Review of Dogmatic Theology, by W. G. T. Shedd. Presbyterian Review, X (January, 1889), 148-151.

Editorial comment on Theological Essays, by W. G. T. Shedd. The Bibliotheca Sacra, XXXV (January, 1878), 199-200.

Editorial review of Discourses and Essays, by W. G. T. Shedd. New Englander, XIV (August, 1856), 363-385.

Editorial review of History of Christian Doctrine, by W. G. T. Shedd. The Princeton Review, XXXVI (January, 1864), 152-180.

Harris, George. "Shedd's Dogmatic Theology." Andover Review, XI (February, 1889), 168-179.

Hodge, A. A. Review of Sermons to the Spiritual Man, by W. G. T. Shedd. Presbyterian Review, V (July, 1884), 566-567.

Morris, Edward D. "Dr. Shedd's System of Theology." Presbyterian Review, X (July, 1889), 353-387.

Peck, T. E. Review of Dogmatic Theology, by W. G. T. Shedd. The Presbyterian Quarterly, III (April, 1889), 288-292.

Ropes, C. J. H. Review of "The Doctrine of Endless Punishment," by W. G. T. Shedd. Andover Review, VIII (July, 1887), 92-94.

Smith, B. M. Review of Commentary on Romans, by W. G. T. Shedd. Southern Presbyterian Review, XXXI (January, 1880), 161-168.

Stevens, George B. "Professor Shedd's Dogmatic Theology." New Englander and Yale Review, L (February, 1889), 73-96.

Strout, Cushing. "Faith and History: The Mind of W. G. T. Shedd." Journal of the History of Ideas, XV (January, 1954), 153-162.

Warfield, B. B. Review of History of Doctrine, by W. G. T. Shedd. The Princeton Review, XXXVI (January, 1864), 169-173.

Whaling, Thornton. Review of Dogmatic Theology, by W. G. T. Shedd. The Presbyterian Quarterly, IX (April, 1895), 324-326.

IV. WORKS BY OR ABOUT SHEDD'S CONTEMPORARIES

Atwater, Lyman. "The Doctrinal Attitude of Old School Presbyterians." The Bibliotheca Sacra, XXI (January, 1864), 65-123.

Bavink, Herman. "The Future of Calvinism." Presbyterian and Reformed Review, V (January, 1894), 1-24.

Brastow, Lewis O. Representative Modern Preachers. New York, 1912.

Briggs, Charles Augustus. The Bible, the Church, and the Reason. New York, 1892.

-------- "Biblical Theology." Presbyterian Review, III (July, 1882), 503-528.

-------- "The Right, Duty, and Limits of Biblical Criticism." Presbyterian Review, II (July, 1881), 550-579.

-------- The Study of the Holy Scripture. Ninth edition; New York, 1899.

-------- Whither? New York, 1889.

Brown, Robert McAfee. P. T. Forsyth: Prophet for Today. Philadelphia, 1952.

Buckham, John Wright. Progressive Religious Thought in America. Boston and New York, 1919.

Channing, William E. Channing's Works. Single volume edition; Boston, 1900.

Denney, James. The Death of Christ. Third edition; New York, 1903.

Duffield, George. "The Doctrines of the New School Presbyterian Church." Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository, XX (July, 1863), 561-635.

Ellicot, C. J. Historical Lectures on the Life of Our Lord. (Husean Lectures for 1859.) Boston, 1866.

Elliott-Binns, L. E. The Development of English Theology in the Later Nineteenth Century. London, 1952.

Fiske, John. Destiny of Man. Boston, 1884.

Hagenbach, K. R. "Neander's Services as a Church Historian." Translated by Henry Boynton Smith. Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository, VIII (October, 1851), 822-857.

Hodge, A. A. Outlines of Theology. Revised and enlarged edition; Grand Rapids, 1928.

Humphry, Zephaniah. "Henry Boynton Smith." Presbyterian Review, II (July, 1881), 486-489.

Lawrence, Edward A. "The Old School in New England Theology." Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository, XX (April, 1863), 311-349.

Liddon, Henry P. The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. (The Bampton Lectures for 1866.) New York, 1869.

Munger, Theodore. Appeal to Life. Fifth edition; New York, 1888.

Neander, Augustus. A General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Translated by Joseph Torrey. Fifth American edition; Boston, 1852.

-------- Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmas. Translated by J. E. Ryland, and edited by J. L. Jacobi. London, 1858.

Newman, John Henry. An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. New edition; New York, 1949.

Park, Edwards A. Discourses. Andover, 1885.

Prentiss, George L. "Infant Salvation and Its Theological Bearings." Presbyterian Review, IV (July, 1883), 548-580.

Pusey, E. B. What Is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment? London, 1880.

Richards, George W. "The Mercersberg Theology--Its Purpose and Principles." Church History, XX (September, 1951), 45-53.

Schaff, Philip. The Person of Christ: the Perfection of His Humanity Viewed as a Proof of His Divinity. Twelfth edition, revised and enlarged; New York, 1882.

Smith, Henry Boynton. "The Nature and Worth of the Science of Church History." Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository, VIII (April, 1851), 412-441.

Stearns, Lewis French. "The Christian Conception of Man." The Andover Review, I (May, 1884), 465-471.

-------- Henry Boynton Smith. Boston and New York, 1892.

-------- Present Day Theology. New York, 1893.

Strong, Augustus Hopkins. Systematic Theology. Sixth edition, revised and enlarged; New York, 1899.

Theology at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century. Essays on the Present Status of Christianity and Its Doctrines. Edited by J. Vyrnwy Morgan. Boston, 1901.

Trench, Richard C. Christ the Desire of All Nations. (Hulsean Lectures for 1846.) Fifth edition, revised; London, 1880.

Warfield, Benjamin B. "Recent Reconstructions of Theology from the Point of View of Systematic Theology." Homiletic Review, XXXV (March, 1898), 201-208.

Wells, Ronald Vale. Three Christian Transcendentalists: James Marsh, Caleb Henry, Frederic Hedge. New York, 1943.

V. COMPARATIVE AND INTERPRETATIVE MATERIAL

Baker, Herschel. The Wars of Truth. Cambridge, Mass., 1952.

Brown, William Adams. A Teacher and His Times. New York, 1940.

Brunner, H. Emil. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. London, 1952.

-------- The Christian Doctrine of God. (Dogmatics, Volume I.) Philadelphia, 1950.

-------- Revelation and Reason; the Christian Doctrine of Faith and Knowledge. Philadelphia, 1946.

Calvin, John. Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Colossians. Translated by John Pringle. Edinburgh, 1851.

Calvin, John. Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. Translated by John Pringle. Edinburgh, 1859. Two volumes.

-------- Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh, 1854.

-------- Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Translated and edited by John Owen. Edinburgh, 1849.

-------- Commentary on the Gospel According to John. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh, 1847. Two volumes.

-------- Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by John Allen. Seventh American edition, revised and corrected; Philadelphia, 1936. Two volumes.

Davies, Rupert E. The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers. London, 1946.

Dillistone, F. W. "A Biblical and Historical Appraisal of Theories of the Atonement." Theology Today, X (July, 1953), 185-195.

Dowey, Edward A., Jr. The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology. New York, 1952.

Green, J. Benjamin. A Harmony of the Westminster Standards. Richmond, 1951.

Howe, John. The Works of the Rev. John Howe. Edited by Edmund Calamy. New York, 1838. Two volumes.

Hunter, A. Mitchell. The Teaching of Calvin. Second edition; London, 1950.

LeCerf, Auguste. An Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics. London, 1949.

Loetscher, Lefferts A. The Broadening Church. Philadelphia, 1953.

Mead, Sidney Earl. Nathaniel William Taylor. Chicago, 1942.

Niesel, Wilhelm. The Theology of Calvin. Philadelphia, 1956.

Passmore, J. A. Ralph Cudworth: an Interpretation. Cambridge, 1951.

Calvin, John. Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. Translated by John Pringle. Edinburgh, 1848. Two volumes.

———. Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh, 1854.

———. Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Translated and edited by John Owen. Edinburgh, 1849.

———. Commentary on the Gospel According to John. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh, 1847. Two volumes.

———. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by John Allen. Seventh American edition, revised and corrected; Philadelphia, 1936. Two volumes.

Davies, Rupert E. The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers. London, 1946.

Dillistone, F. W. "A Biblical and Historical Appraisal of Theories of the Atonement." Theology Today, X (July, 1953), 185-195.

Dowey, Edward A., Jr. The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology. New York, 1952.

Green, J. Benjamin. A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards. Richmond, 1951.

Howe, John. The Works of the Rev. John Howe. Edited by Edmund Calamy. New York, 1838. Two volumes.

Hunter, A. Mitchell. The Teaching of Calvin. Second edition; London, 1950.

Lecerf, Auguste. An Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics. London, 1949.

Loetscher, Lefferts A. The Broadening Church. Philadelphia, 1954.

Mead, Sidney Earl. Nathaniel William Taylor. Chicago, 1942.

Niesel, Wilhelm. The Theology of Calvin. Philadelphia, 1956.

Passmore, J. A. Ralph Cudworth: An Interpretation. Cambridge, 1951.

Theology at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century. Essays on the Present Status of Christianity and Its Doctrines. Edited by J. Vyrnwy Morgan. Boston, 1901.

Visser't Hooft, W. A. _The Kingship of Christ._ New York, 1948.

Wiley, Basil. _Nineteenth Century Studies._ London, 1949.

Williams, Daniel Day. _The Andover Liberals: a Study in American Theology._ New York, 1941.

BIOGRAPHY

Bernard Vernon Munger, the son of the late Otho Henry Munger and Iva Williams Munger of Athol, Kansas, was born on July 28, 1915. After the death of his father and the marriage of his mother to Herman Henrichs, he moved to Smith Center, Kansas, where he attended the public schools. He received the B. A. degree from Washburn Municipal University, Topeka, Kansas, in 1938. After one year of study in the Princeton Theological Seminary, he transferred to the Chicago Theological Seminary and was awarded the B. D. degree in 1942. He was appointed a Gurney Harriss Kearns Fellow at Duke University for the academic year 1942-1943. He was also a resident student in Duke University the second semester of the academic year 1945-1946, and the whole of the academic year 1946-1947.

Ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in 1942, he has served Congregational-Christian churches in Washington, D. C., and Graham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina. He was assistant professor of Bible at Southwestern at Memphis during the academic year 1950-1951, and since that time has been minister of the First Presbyterian Church, U. S., Corinth, Mississippi.

BIOGRAPHY

[illegible]ard Vernon Munger, the son of the late Otto Henry Munger and Iva Williams Munger of Athol, Kansas, was born on July 2[illegible], 1915. After the death of his father and the marriage of his mother to Herman Hendricks, he moved to Smith [illegible], Kansas, where he attended the public schools. He received the [illegible] . . [illegible], Kansas, in 1938. After one year of study in the [illegible]n Theological Seminary, he transferred to the Chicago Theological Seminary and was awarded the B. D. degree in 1942. [illegible] appointed a Gurney Harriss Kearns Fellow at Duke University [illegible] the academic year 1942-1943. He was also a [illegible] [illegible]nt in Duke University the second semester of the [illegible] year 1945-1946, and the whole of the academic year [illegible]-1951.

Ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in 1942, he has served Congregational-Christian churches in Washington, D. C., and Graham and Chapel Hill, [illegible]olina. He was assistant professor of Bible at [illegible]thwestern at Memphis during the academic year 1950-1951, and since that time has been minister of the First Presbyterian Church, U. S., Corinth, Mississippi.